

FANTASY FOOTBALL PARTICIPATION AND MEDIA USAGE

---

A Dissertation  
presented to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School  
University of Missouri-Columbia

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
Of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

By  
TROY O. COMEAU

Dr. Michael Kramer, Dissertation Supervisor

December 2007

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

FANTASY FOOTBALL PARTICIPATION AND MEDIA USAGE

presented by Troy O. Comeau,

a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

---

Professor Michael Kramer

---

Professor Jennifer Aubrey

---

Professor Richard Cox

---

Professor Debbie Dougherty

---

Professor Michael Porter

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research project would not have been possible without the support of the current and former faculty and staff of the Department of Communication at the University of Missouri – Columbia. Before I arrived at the University I was well aware of the quality of education being offered in the department, it was the main reason I chose MU. The knowledge and insight I have gained from these professors is invaluable to me.

I would first like to thank my committee. Dr. Michael Kramer has given me the support and encouragement needed to complete my education while teaching full time at Pittsburg State University. In the beginning he warned me about the difficulties of completing my degree while working full time and he was right. I could not have stayed on track without his encouragement. Dr. Michael Porter has been a motivator as well. Being able to work with him in a mass lecture class showed me that it is still possible to care about each and every student you meet, no matter how many of them are in front of you. Dr. Debbie Dougherty stepped in for me at a time of change within the department. During her qualitative class, she taught me the importance a researcher has not only to the field but also the subjects under investigation. Dr. Richard Cox helped me fine tune my study by providing a link to sports psychology and mass media. Dr. Jennifer Aubrey was also kind enough to step in and serve on the committee during a time of change in the department. I wish I had more of an opportunity to learn from her knowledge of mass communication.

In addition, I would like to thank two former professors who helped me along the way when I first began the Doctoral program. Dr. Michael Stephenson was my first advisor. He gave me my first insight into mass communication research. Dr. R. Lance

Holbert also gave me an opportunity to study mass media effects and the opportunity to join him on research he was working on. Both of these instructors helped shape me into who I am today.

I would also like to thank the faculty and administration at Pittsburg State University for believing in me. I don't think I could have completed this process without the support of a number of people at Pittsburg State. I would especially like to thank my Department Chair, mentor and friend Dr. Pete Hamilton and my Dean Dr. Lynette Olson. Their support means more to me than they will ever know.

I could not have completed this program without the support of my family. My parents Jack and Phyllis have always been behind me no matter what I chose to do. Their support both emotionally and financially have helped me get where I am today and now my dad can finally tell everyone his son has a PhD. My brother, Travis has always been an inspiration to me. My studies have taken me away from time spent with him, but now that this part of my journey is complete I hope we grow closer than ever.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Lorie and son Jesse for all the love and support they've given to me. Throughout this sometimes difficult process I tried to always remember that my family came first. Sometimes however that may not have appeared to be the case and I thank them for their understanding and encouragement. I'm sure at times this process of being away and working nights and weekends has been harder on the two of them than it has on me. I love you both, never forget that.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....                      | ii  |
| LIST OF TABLES .....                        | v   |
| ABSTRACT .....                              | vi  |
| Chapter                                     |     |
| 1. INTRODUCTION .....                       | 1   |
| 2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....                   | 8   |
| Uses and Gratification Research             |     |
| Sports Needs Research                       |     |
| Research Questions                          |     |
| 3. METHODS .....                            | 53  |
| 4. RESULTS .....                            | 72  |
| 5. DISCUSSION .....                         | 102 |
| Theoretical Implications                    |     |
| Limitations                                 |     |
| Future Research and Implications            |     |
| APPENDIX                                    |     |
| A. SCRIPT READ TO PARTICIPANTS.....         | 117 |
| B. CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH ..... | 118 |
| C. RESEARCH SURVEY .....                    | 119 |
| REFERENCES .....                            | 126 |
| VITA.....                                   | 137 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Correlations for pre-exposure selectivity .....                            | 58   |
| 2. Correlations for affective involvement .....                               | 60   |
| 3. Correlations for cognitive involvement.....                                | 61   |
| 4. Correlations for behavioral involvement.....                               | 62   |
| 5. NFL Viewing Motivation Factor Loadings.....                                | 63   |
| 6. Correlations for Exciting Entertainment .....                              | 64   |
| 7. Correlations for Pass Time .....   | 65   |
| 8. Correlations for Information .....   | 66   |
| 9. Correlations for Companionship .....                                       | 66   |
| 10. Correlations for Escape .....   | 67   |
| 11. Correlations for Eustress .....   | 68   |
| 12. Correlations for Risk-Taking .....  | 68   |
| 13. Correlations for Knowledge .....  | 69   |
| 14. Correlations for Self-Esteem.....   | 69   |
| 15. Correlations for Group Affiliation .....                                  | 69   |
| 16. Correlations for Escape .....   | 70   |
| 17. Correlations for Aesthetics.....  | 70   |
| 18. Correlations for All Variables .....                                      | 73   |
| 19. Regression Coefficients for Media Use.....                                | 87   |
| 20. Regression Coefficients for Pre-exposure Selectivity and Involvement..... | 91   |
| 21. Regression Coefficients for Instrumental Viewing Patterns .....           | 93   |
| 22. Regression Coefficients for Ritualistic Viewing Patterns.....             | 95   |
| 23. Regression Coefficients for gratifications received .....                 | 99   |

THE EFFECTS OF FANTASY FOOTBALL PARTICIPATION  
ON MEDIA USES AND GRATIFICATIONS

Troy O. Comeau

Dr. Michael Kramer, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This study looked at the effects fantasy football participation had on media use, audience activity, viewing motivation patterns and gratifications received when simultaneously examining the effects of sport fandom identification and gender.

By using regression analysis, the results indicate that when examined simultaneously with sport fandom identification and gender, fantasy football participation had a significant effect on the amount of electronic media use, involvement, and the gratification variables of eustress, self-esteem, knowledge and group affiliation. No significant effect was found on the amount of use of print media, pre-exposure selectivity, instrumental/ritualistic viewing patterns, and the gratification variables of risk-taking, escape and aesthetics. In addition, sport fandom identification was also found to be a significant predictor of most variables related to media use, pre-exposure selectivity, involvement, and gratifications received. Sports fandom identification did not predict radio use or gratifications received from risk-taking.

The results of this study suggest that factors which are part of the viewing context, in this case fantasy football participation and sports fandom identification have some effect on the amount of media use and gratifications received. This study has provided support to the idea that the viewing context should be considered an important factor when taking a uses and gratifications approach to research.

## Chapter 1: Introduction

With recent technological advances such as on-line internet, satellite television, and web phones, more individuals than ever are using mass media outlets to participate in fantasy sporting leagues. A fantasy sports league allows an individual, together with others, to assemble a league of fictitious teams with real professional or college players. These teams are chosen by picking individual players and then playing a fantasy game amongst each other. The professional or college players are given points based on their performance during the actual games they play. The points given to these players are added together with others that are on a fantasy team. The points are used in a fantasy game to determine winners and losers of the league. According to a Harris Interactive study, an estimated 30 million people play fantasy sports in the United States and 6 million of those are on-line players, where stats are updated automatically (Zillgett, 2000). Many others still keep stats on their own, but these stats are found through newspaper and internet sites. This participation is creating a fan who is not only concerned about a team's performance, but also interested in an individual player's statistics and news about players, such as injuries. This desire for knowledge about individual players appears to be changing fan consumption of media for sports, the use they have for this media, and even the way sports media is presented to the fan.

A fantasy sports league is fairly simple. Individuals assemble together and choose different players they feel will perform well through a mock draft. These chosen players form a fantasy team with the individual being termed the team owner. Drafts can be set up much like the professional organizations where each owner takes turn picking a player one at a time to be on their fantasy team until all roster positions are filled. Just like a



professional league, owners can only pick so many players to be on their fantasy team. These roster positions vary from league to league but will usually consist of a starting roster and bench players. Starting roster positions can also vary from league to league, but usually resemble that of a professional leagues starting roster. For example, a fantasy football league may consist of starting one player who plays quarterback, two who play running back, three wide receivers, one tight end and one kicker. These positions are similar to that of professional football. Bench players will remain on the team, but not count in the overall point total for the week. Most leagues only allow a player to be drafted to one team, but leagues exist where a player can be chosen to be on multiple teams. The goal of this type of league is to find the best combination of players to score points each week.

Drafts vary, but one type can be set up in “rounds” where every team gets one pick during each round. This type of draft can also be set up to where each round will reverse the picking order from the previous round. Thus, the team owner that picked last in round one would be the first pick in round two. This type of draft is known as a snake draft or serpentine draft and is done to make sure one team does not have an advantage by picking first every round. A second type of fantasy draft is the auction style draft in which every team is given fake money to bid on players. Team owners may bid as much as they want to on an individual player, but must also stay under a predetermined salary cap. This style attempts to make the team owner assign value to an individual players worth and also gives every owner a chance at every individual player. Finally, a third common draft style is an automated draft. This style is typically done through a web

service and allows owners to pre-rank individual players and then on a selected time and date, a computer chooses players automatically based on those pre-rankings.

Although the players selected usually come from professional sports leagues, fantasy leagues also exist at the college level. Generally, the league is composed of eight to twelve team owners and each professional or college player is only chosen to one fantasy team. Each league has a scoring system and rules that are agreed upon by all individuals. Most rules resemble that of the professional sports leagues. For example, in a fantasy football league, if a player scores a touchdown, the fantasy team is credited with six points. Points can also be given for other individual statistics such as completed passes, receptions, rushing/receiving/passing/return yards, field goals, extra points, two-point conversions, etc. Points can also be deducted from a player for throwing an interception, fumbling, missing a field goal or extra point, getting sacked, etc. The goal is to assemble a team that will score the most points. Fantasy leagues can be set up head-to-head where one team plays another each week and is given a win/loss based on the result, or a league can be set up where teams accumulate points each week and the overall point total at the end of the season determines the winner. Since the fantasy team owners receive points based on how individual players perform, the performance of the real professional or college team may be less important to a fantasy player. For example, a team owner could win their fantasy game with the help of a running back rushing for over one-hundred yards and two touchdowns, but the real team the player was on could lose the game. The fantasy owner may then watch games to cheer on individuals, not the team. This social activity may be creating a highly involved fan who seeks out information by reading or watching games they normally would not care about.

Often times, fantasy leagues are set up to play with friends or co-workers, but leagues consisting of complete strangers also exist. Although leagues exist with no real reward, it is common to reward the winning fantasy owner at the end of the season. Reward leagues usually come from a monetary entry fee with rewards given in the form of cash, trips, trophies, plaques, rings, sports memorabilia, and other forms of merchandise (Beason, 2004). The desire to play in a fantasy sports league seems to be for friendly competition, but this desire to win is also having an effect on fans consumption of sports media.

Fantasy league membership seems to impact fan behavior. A 2002 online survey by the National Football League reported that fans engaged in fantasy football play watched an average of two to three hours more football each Sunday than did the average fan. The survey also found that 40 percent of fantasy players logged onto the internet at least once while watching a game on television (Cox, 2002). According to CBS Sportsline.com, their website traffic increases dramatically on Sunday afternoon, the prime viewing time for the National Football League (Walker, 2005). A 2004 survey also found that individuals spent an average of 45 minutes per week just thinking about fantasy sports (Beason, 2004).

With such a demand for fantasy sports information, media outlets have changed and even created new ways to reach fans. Magazine and newspaper companies are making a profit by predicting individual trends and giving advice to the fantasy player. Fox Sports Network, CBS, and ESPN have all aired a half-hour show providing fantasy football advice on which players were going to perform well in an upcoming week (Shipman, 2001). CBS has begun giving viewers instant statistics about a player

following a play. Halftime shows now include a fantasy notebook section which gives up to the minute statistics of high profile players. Direct TV offers subscribers a pay service called the “Red Zone” in which they will display an NFL football game every time a team is inside the twenty yard line. This allows viewers the opportunity to watch a potential scoring drive and see who scores and how they scored. The fantasy sports craze, in short, is changing the way we see and acquire sports knowledge.

There are fantasy leagues for just about every sport imaginable. An individual who has an interest in hockey, baseball, football, auto-racing, basketball, and even golf can find a fantasy league for them. Despite these options, without a doubt, the most popular of all of the fantasy games is fantasy football. Since its beginnings in an Oakland, California bar in the mid 1960’s, fantasy football has grown into a multimillion-dollar industry. An estimated 15 million adults play fantasy football and spend more than \$250 million a year just subscribing to online gaming services (Walker, 2005). Within the last four years, Las Vegas has hosted the World Championships of Fantasy Football. Much like the World Series of Poker, the players pay a \$1,250 entrance fee for a chance to win \$200,000 (Sandomir, 2002).

With so much money being spent, and gambling issues coming into play, online gaming giants have created The Fantasy Sports Trade Association (FSTA) and the National Fantasy Football Center (NFFC). These non-profit organizations were founded to not only promote the sport, but also to protect the commercial and consumer rights of individual players and business owners from gaming laws and government regulations (Cox, 2002). For example, the FSTA allows members access to publications and professional attorneys to make sure their fantasy leagues are not in violation of being a

sweepstakes or gambling league. The FSTA also provides current market research on the fantasy industry. Although these organizations exist mainly to protect players and services from legal issues, they have also developed programs to introduce math concepts into grade schools by using the fantasy game concept.

Despite the recent growth and popularity of the game, the small amount of academic research that exists on fantasy sports leagues deal with gambling issues (Bernhard, 2005), the analysis of online conversations (Hiltner, 1996), and using the game to enhance marketing concepts (Gillentine, 2001). Many articles are written daily in popular magazines and newspapers giving advice to the fantasy owner, but little research has examined if differences exist in the psychological needs and mass media consumption of the fantasy owner compared to a fan not participating in the game. Academic research has largely ignored how this social phenomenon of fantasy play is changing the uses a person has for the media and the gratification one receives from this media. Current popular research indicates that fantasy owners seem to be consuming more media and the media are making changes to adapt to the fantasy owners need for information, but does this game playing change the uses and gratifications sought from the media? Is there a difference in the fantasy owner compared to the average fan on gratifications sought from the media? For example, does the fantasy owner seek information by watching sports while the average fan seeks entertainment?

The present study attempts to look at the uses and gratifications of media by fantasy football participants. The study examines participants in a fantasy football league and compares their uses and gratifications of the media with that of similar fans not participating in these leagues. This study will review current trends and literature of uses

and gratification research, review current media studies about sports, and look at the motives a sports fan has for consuming sports both live and on the media.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### Uses and Gratification Research

Uses and gratifications research is an audience centered approach attempting to understand not only why individuals use the mass media, but also the effects using the media may have on an individual (Perse, 1990). Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974) are noted for defining uses and gratifications research as the attempt to uncover “the social and psychological origins of needs, which generate expectations of the mass media and other sources, which lead to differential patterns of media exposure resulting in need gratifications and other consequences” (p. 20). Taking this approach, in order to understand how media affect people, we must first understand how people use the media.

Early uses and gratifications research of the 1940’s tended to be qualitative in nature. Research attempted to create labels for categories of use, largely ignoring the frequency distribution of these uses in the population (Ruggiero, 2000). For example, Herzog (1940) concluded that radio quiz programs were listened to for competition, education, or for self-rating; radio soap operas were listened to for an emotional release, fantasy thinking, or for advice; and Berelson (1949) found that newspapers were read for social prestige, escape from everyday life, or a necessary everyday tool used for gaining information. The goal of such research was to learn why people used certain media content. This early research simply created labels of gratifications for consuming media, but generally did not explore the links between the psychological or sociological origins of the needs satisfied and the gratifications sought. Critics argued that this type of research relied too heavily on self-reports, was unsophisticated about the social origin of the needs that audiences bring to the media, was too uncritical of the possible dysfunction

both for self and society of certain kinds of audience satisfaction, and was too captivated by audience uses to pay attention to the media messages. (Katz, 1987).

During the 1950's and 1960's, researchers attempted to answer the critics by identifying and operationalizing many social and psychological variables that were presumed to be the beginning of different patterns of media consumption for gratifications (Ruggiero, 2000). During this period, several variables were introduced as possible reasons for media consumption. For example, Katz and Foulkes (1962) identified escape as a reason for mass media use. Mendelsohn (1964) also identified other variables such as companionship, passing time, gathering information, and aiding in social interactions as reasons for radio use. Johnstone (1974) attempted to uncover social reasons for media exposure among adolescents. He identified perceived social status from others and ones own perception of social status as variables that effected the time spent watching television. However, uses and gratifications still had a vague conceptual framework, a confused explanatory apparatus, and failed to consider audiences' perceptions of media content (Elliott, 1974).

These criticisms prompted researchers in the 70's to work on comprehensive lists of social and psychological needs that exposure to the mass media may satisfy. For example, Katz, Gurevitch, and Haas (1973) categorized mass media needs into strengthening understanding, strengthening status, and strengthening contact with others. McQuail, Blumler, and Brown (1972) identified the primary needs for television viewing as diversion, companionship, personal identity, and surveillance. Rosengren and Windahl (1972) also found that needs for interaction and identification had an effect on involvement with the media and using the media to mimic face-to-face interactions.



During this period, Rosengren (1974) suggested that needs were a complex web which interacted with personal characteristics and the social environment of an individual. Rosengren's comments were strengthened by a study which concluded that media availability, work schedules and social constraints had an effect on media uses and gratification of public television (Palmgreen & Rayburn, 1979).

The 1980's and 1990's were devoted to trying to uncover models for the uses and gratification perspective. Palmgreen and Rayburn conducted a number of studies at this particular time in an attempt to create a model for uses and gratification researchers to follow. The simplest model predicted that media satisfaction may be viewed as the sum of all gratifications obtained (Palmgreen, Wenner, & Rayburn, 1981). The idea was to identify as many gratifications obtained through factor analysis and add them up. The higher the score, the more satisfied the audience member. This model has been criticized because it did not consider the fact that some gratifications may be more important to an audience member than others (Palmgreen & Rayburn, 1985).

A better model seemed to be one which took into account the extent to which a gratification obtained (GO) is actually a gratification sought (GS) by an audience member. The researchers presented a model which predicted that media exposure was the absolute difference between the gratifications an audience member sought and the gratifications they actually obtain (Palmgreen & Rayburn, 1979), or in other words, the sum of  $|GO - GS|$ . This model has come to be known as the absolute value discrepancy model. However, this model, too, was criticized because it did not seem reasonable that a situation where GO exceeded GS was equal to a situation where GS exceeded GO (Wenner, 1986). Because of this criticism, a simplified discrepancy model was

introduced. This model predicted that media satisfaction was the sum of GO – GS (Wenner, 1986). In this model, if GS exceeds GO, a negative sign will be given. While Palmgreen and Rayburn agreed with the basic logic behind the simplified discrepancy model, they noted that it did not take into account the affective evaluation of the audience member. For example, although most uses and gratifications studies measure positively evaluated needs, a model was needed that could also take into account negatively evaluated attributes of the media. Avoidance would be an item that could be studied which would involve a negatively evaluated attribute. Palmgreen and Rayburn believed that a model was needed to make sure that a high GS on a negatively evaluated attribute would not result in the prediction of satisfaction toward the media. This fact began the merger of uses and gratification research with expectancy-value theory.

The expectancy-value approach postulates that beliefs about a source are the primary informational components determining the seeking of gratifications (Palmgreen & Rayburn, 1985a). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) identified three kinds of beliefs associated with a source. *Descriptive beliefs* come from a direct observation of an object. For example, an individual will form a belief about a mass media source from direct use of the medium. *Informational beliefs* come from information acquired from an outside source about the object. Here, a person may form a belief based on information given from friends or colleagues about a media source. This belief system could be strongest with media to which an individual has very little direct exposure. Finally, *inferential beliefs* are ones that are formed with no direct observations of the object. For the mass media, a person may use cultural or social stereotypes and norms to form a belief about a source that was not observed first hand. By having beliefs about various sources, an

individual will form expectations about that particular source. For example, an individual may have certain beliefs about what television will do for them. Over time, these beliefs will cause an individual to create certain expectations from television.

From a uses and gratifications perspective, if expectations of the media are met, satisfaction results and consumption continues. If expectations are not met, dissatisfaction results and use discontinues (Perse & Ferguson, 1993). The basic idea here is that people expect certain media or certain media situations to gratify certain needs over others. This would create some GS and GO to be weighed more heavily during certain media uses or media situations. Taking this into account, Palmgreen and Rayburn (1985a) introduced the expectancy-value discrepancy model. This model says that media satisfaction is equal to the sum of  $e(GO - GS)$  where  $e$  is the audience members affective evaluation of the gratification. Dobos (1992) found support for this model when looking at communication technology and media satisfaction in organizations.

With the introduction of true models that uses and gratification researchers could build upon, Rubin (1983) noted that researchers were gaining ground on their critics. Since the main arguments against uses and gratifications research were that it had a vague conceptual framework, a confused explanatory apparatus, and a failure to consider audiences' perceptions of media content, Rubin concluded that systematic attempts were being made to modify replications or extensions of studies, refine methodology, analyze the findings of separate investigations comparatively, and treat mass media use as an integrated communication and social phenomenon.

Today, Rubin (2002) outlines a contemporary view of uses and gratifications which includes five basic assumptions:

1. Communication behavior is goal-directed, purposive, and motivated.
2. Media audiences are active and initiate the selection and use of media.
3. A host of social and psychological factors guide, filter or mediate behavior.
4. The media is in direct competition with other forms of communication and in some cases serves as a functional alternative to our needs, motives, or desires.
5. The influence media has on people is smaller than the influence of society.

Using these assumptions, Rubin (2002) suggests that today's uses and gratifications research is going in a variety of different directions, three of which are important to this study. One direction has been to compare motives across media. This is a common direction for researchers, especially when newer technology is introduced. For example, Leung and Wei (2000) found that the use of cellular phones and the gratification one received from their use is similar to that of the conventional telephone, except that cellular phones were also found to satisfy mobility and immediacy needs. Likewise, Kaye (1998) concluded that the uses of the World Wide Web differed only slightly from that of television. The strongest needs for web use were entertainment, social interaction, and passing time, while the strongest motivation for television use was passing time. Robinson, Barth, and Kohut (1997) also found that newer technology, in this case personal computer use, did not have a significant impact on time spent with traditional mass media. The researchers found that the personal computer is more of a "time-enhancing" device for finding information. The researchers compared the personal computer to other devices used to save time such as the automobile and the washing machine. For example, we still may spend a large amount of time traveling now like when we did not have automobiles, except now we can travel farther; we still spend a

large amount of time cleaning, but now we can clean a larger amount; and we still spend time with informational outlets, but now we can consume more information.

At the heart of this type of research is the idea that media is functional to its users. Flanagin and Metzger (2001) said that “functionalism of the mass media could be understood through an examination of which technologies users associate closely with one another and the purposes for which a medium is used” (p. 159). The key idea here is that the mass media serves a function for the individual to satisfy certain needs that exist.

Ferguson and Perse (2000) set up a study to determine if the world wide web could serve as a functional alternative to television. In other words, they were interested in determining if internet web sites were gratifying the same sort of needs as television and could thus be a functional alternative to television viewing. Their results were mixed. Like television, the World Wide Web functioned as an entertainment escape from everyday life. Like television, the internet was rated high in entertainment and passage of time. However, this study also concluded that the World Wide Web differs functionally from television viewing in that web surfing was not rated as a relaxing pastime. Television viewing for relaxation has been proven to be the second-most important reason for watching (Rubin, 1983). Web surfing was not listed as a relaxing pastime. Also, web-sites tend to be used more for informational usage than television. The internet is designed for a highly active individual who must physically enter a web address to access the page. It is more purposeful and goal-directed than just simply turning on a television channel.

Coffey and Stipp (1997) also found that there were functional differences in how individuals used the internet as opposed to television. They concluded that television,

especially advertising, could be a powerful medium to drive individuals to internet sites. Since television viewing time is still overwhelmingly larger than internet surfing and with television being a source of relaxation, the audience could be hit with an informational web address when they least expect it. What is not clear is if these media function differently in different situations. For example, perhaps television is viewed for more informational purposes for fantasy players where it is primary entertaining to the non-fantasy playing fan.

Besides comparing motives across media, Rubin (2002) suggests that a second direction for uses and gratification research has been to identify links among media-use motives and exposure and their associations with media attitudes and behaviors. This type of research is grounded by the idea that the mass media audience members are active processors of information. Although some communication scholars see the mass media audience as passive, just reacting to the messages given from the mass media, uses and gratifications theory views people as active communicators because they are aware of their communication goals, evaluate different communication channels, and select the channels they believe will gratify the needs they possess (Perse & Dunn, 1998).

The activity level of an audience is usually measured by the utility, intentionality, selectivity, and involvement of the audience with the media (Blumler, 1979). Of these four, Levy and Windahl (1985) identified preexposure selectivity of a medium and involvement during the media experience to be the most crucial to the uses and gratifications perspective. Preexposure selectivity represents an audience member's intention to use the media. Involvement is a more complicated concept that will be defined in greater detail later, but can be summed up as the attention one pays to the

media, the amount one identifies with the media, and the amount one talks to and about the media. An audience member who was high in both preexposure selectivity of the medium and high in involvement during exposure was seen as very motivated in the gratification seeking process and had many needs. A viewer who was low in both preexposure selectivity and involvement during exposure was seen as not as motivated in gratification seeking and used the media just to pass time. An example of this type of viewer would be one who habitually uses the media at a certain time or someone who turns on the radio or television for background noise. Lin (1993) found similar results in that viewing selectivity, viewing involvement, and postviewing involvement and utility accounted for a significant amount of variance in gratifications obtained from television viewing. Lin went on to note that more variance in a model could be obtained by adding more variables such as demographics, lifestyles, leisure patterns, or social involvement.

Fantasy football could be seen as an activity which creates a higher level of involvement in the viewers. Not only do the viewers experience the actual football game, but they also are involved in a second game. The fantasy football experience allows a viewer another way to experience the thrill of winning or losing besides just watching the actual game. Fantasy football player's teams are affected by what individual players do on the field. This results in the desire to watch more and pay greater attention to certain players. This attention could lead to greater preexposure selectivity and involvement. A regular football game is one game between two teams at a set location. Fantasy football involves different players of different teams playing in multiple games. An audience member may actively seek out certain games to watch, even pay extra to watch certain games, and watch more closely for statistics and injury during games if he/she plays

fantasy football. By playing the game of fantasy football, a viewer's activity level may increase as well as behavioral effects such as watching more or paying to view certain games. This may give uses and gratification researchers another demographic variable to consider when determining gratifications sought for sports media consumption.

A key concept in audience activity is involvement. Involvement has been defined in persuasion and marketing research as a precommunication condition that reflects perceived importance of information and the reactions people will have to a message (Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1965). However, interpersonal, political, and mass communication research has used Krugman's (1966) idea that involvement also includes direct personal experience during message reception which causes a viewer to pay more attention to the content, identify with the characters, and react more emotionally to what is viewed. Rubin and Perse (1987a) identified three types of involvement and related them to audience activity:

1. The degree to which an audience member pays attention to and thinks about a message is known as *cognitive involvement*.
2. The degree to which an audience member identifies with a particular character, and believes that their interests are joined is known as *affective involvement*.
3. The degree to which an audience member talks about media messages with other audience members is known as *behavioral involvement*.

These two researchers examined the role of motives, attitudes, media selectivity and media use in explaining affective, cognitive and behavioral involvement. For their study, postviewing cognition was used to describe cognitive involvement, parasocial interaction was used to describe affective involvement, and postviewing discussion was used to describe behavioral involvement. They found that more active viewers, those with salient viewing motivations, intention, and attention, were engaged in more postviewing



cognition involvement, parasocial interactions, and postviewing discussions (Rubin & Perse, 1987a).

Included in many affective involvement studies is the formation process of parasocial interactions. Horton and Wohl (1956) described parasocial interactions as ones which create an illusion of face-to-face interactions. These relationships are thought to exist based on two competing models of media behavior. The first, known as the deficiency paradigm, assumes that parasocial interaction acts as a surrogate for face-to-face interpersonal relationships and sees it as catering to individuals who, because of environmental or psychological limitations, lack such relationships (Tsao, 1996). In order to understand parasocial relationships, this model suggests that researchers should isolate the social need that is missing in order to understand media use. The second model is the global-use paradigm, which assumes that parasocial interaction is a more universal experience in which all individuals may readily engage, regardless of whether they are satisfied with their face to face relationships (Tsao, 1996). This model suggests that parasocial relationships are formed by everyone, but the strength and situations surrounding the relationship may tell more about media use than the social needs that are missing in an individual. For uses and gratification research, the deficiency paradigm says that parasocial relationships and interactions may be formed to fulfill a social need that is missing in one's life. Media use will increase for individuals who need to fulfill this social need. The global-use paradigm says that the strength and situation of the relationship is more important to media use than the social needs.

Regardless of which model one takes, researchers have been focusing on determining how parasocial interactions are formed and maintained. For example, Rubin

and Perse (1987a) found that viewing attention, perceived realism, and attractiveness of the characters on soap opera content correlated with parasocial interaction. Hoffner (1996) found that parasocial interaction by children toward male characters was predicted by intelligence, attractiveness, and, for boys only, strength. The only predictor for parasocial interaction by children toward female characters was attractiveness. Rubin, Perse, and Powell (1985) also found that parasocial interaction was predicted by news viewing for information, but that loneliness and parasocial interaction were not correlated. Because of such research, Rubin (2002) has concluded that viewers with high involvement, not necessarily high exposure, appear to form parasocial relationships. If this is true, an activity that promotes media involvement may lead to more parasocial interaction.

Fantasy football could create a situation that promotes parasocial relationships if it is found to create more involvement in the media audience. If involvement does in fact promote more parasocial interactions, fantasy football could foster one to yell at individual players more, congratulate them on a job well done, or even scream at the coaches for more playing time or different play calling while engaging in sports through mass media outlets. It has already been found that soap opera viewing fosters individuals to write letters to their favorite stars often addressing them by character name (Sood & Rogers, 2000). Fantasy football could also foster such behaviors. Fans may write letters to players or to coaches demanding more playing time.

The one thing that researchers seem to agree on is that parasocial relationships are strengthened over time with a greater amount of media exposure. Once a parasocial relationship is established, a media consumer finds greater appreciation for the character,

often viewing him/her as a counselor or role model (Papa, 2000). Fantasy football play lends itself to the formation of parasocial relationships. Not only are the fantasy football players watching a game because of their love of the sport; they also have a vested interest in the individual outcomes of the player. The viewer has a greater chance to win their fantasy game if the individual player performs well. This situation creates more personal involvement in what the viewer is watching. Since sports is basically about winning and losing, not only is a team's fate at stake when watching a professional football game, but the fantasy player's fate is also at stake with individual players performances. Since uses and gratification research is an audience centered approach and individuals have many different needs, involvement itself does not guarantee a parasocial relationship will be formed, but it does appear that a person with greater involvement is more likely to form this type of relationship.

A third research direction for uses and gratification research Rubin (2002) suggests has been to examine the different social and psychological circumstances of media use. Since the uses and gratifications perspective sees the audience as not equally active at all times, certain psychological and sociological variables come into play to determine how active the audience member is at any one specific point in time (Rubin, 2002). The biggest obstacle to mass media researchers is that these variables do not occur in a vacuum and are not the same for every individual. A host of social and psychological factors are involved in shaping the choice individuals have for using communication mediums (Rubin, 2002). Such factors as predispositions, the physical and social environment, interpersonal interactions, and communication channel availability all work to shape individual needs and individual media choices. Although labeled as obstacles,

these factors can also be seen as very promising for researchers interested in understanding why individuals use certain media.

Although the ultimate goal of uses and gratifications is to understand media effects, this perspective has evolved from psychological and sociological models of indirect individual effects (Rubin & Rubin, 1985). Rosengren (1974) outlined a paradigm of uses and gratifications research. At the heart of his paradigm were certain basic human needs of lower and higher order. He used Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of basic human needs to give structure to his argument. Maslow distinguishes five sets of basic human needs: physiological needs (such as water and oxygen), safety needs (such as shelter), belongingness and love needs (such as friends and marriage), self-esteem needs (such as the belief that an individual fits in or is accepted by others), and self-actualization needs (such as the belief that an individual has reached full potential). Because Rosengren (1974) saw the uses and gratification process as one which interacts with societal structure and with personality and social characteristics, belongingness and love needs, self-esteem needs, and self-actualization needs deserve the attention of uses and gratifications researchers. Since fantasy football play occurs in a group and a winner and loser is determined, needs fulfilled by the media in fantasy sports play could certainly be centered around belongingness, self-esteem and self-actualization. For example, an individual may watch a game with other fantasy competitors creating a social need to watch. Or, the individual may watch a game to see if they made the correct decision by starting one player over another. This type of viewing would reinforce the self-esteem and self-actualization needs one possesses.

Along with psychological needs, sociological issues come into play as well. For example, there have been certain instances where the media that an individual has become dependent on is no longer there for a time. For example, an individual may turn on a favorite program but the station is off the air, or log on to a web-site only to find that the web-site will not come up. Such an experience creates tension in the individual because the need gratification that is being sought is not being fulfilled (no gratification obtained). In such cases, deprivation theory has been used to explain the effects of tension in an individual. For example, Cohen (1981) examined a general media strike and Walker (1990) analyzed viewers' reactions to the 1987 National Football League players' strike. The conclusions of these studies were very similar in that deprivations were related to media variables such as exposure, involvement and motives. Also, Windahl, Hojerback, and Hedinsson (1986) found that individuals in more socially oriented environments tended to feel more deprived than those in conceptually oriented settings. This means that an individual who is socially active and around a group will feel more deprived than an individual who is not as socially active because there is an information loss. In contrast, a person who is not as socially active, does not have such a strong social need and the deprivation level is less. Flanagin and Metzger (2001) also concluded that "recent models of media selection and use suggest that it is not primarily the attributes of media that determine use, but rather such factors as assessments of needs fulfillment, appropriateness, social norms, and peer evaluations of media" (p. 158). Thus, in terms of the function the mass media plays in fulfilling gratifications, it would appear that individuals who are more socially active tend to select media more carefully and show greater media deprivation levels when it is taken away.

In some instances fantasy football could be seen as a socially engaging activity. Many times the game is played with family, friends, or co-workers and watching the game and gathering information creates something to talk about with others. By being socially based, fantasy football play could create a viewer who craves more information and is more functionally dependent on the mass media to gain this information.

Since individuals have been found to select media more carefully when engaged in a social activity, uses and gratification researchers have turned to models to account for this activity. A model of media use that takes into account the social activity of an individual is the social influence model of technology use (Fulk & Boyd, 1991). This model recognizes that media perceptions are subjective and socially constructed. Influences can come from others, through vicarious learning, and from situational factors. Fulk (1993) found that one's working group predicted individual attitudes toward and use of certain communication technologies and this prediction was stronger when group attraction was high rather than low. This model is consistent with the uses and gratification approach in that it sees the individual as purposive and active, specifying that people select media based on needs. Thus, contrary to models of media selection that propose that individuals select media based on the features or attributes of the technology, this model sees individuals as active processors of subjective and contextual information (Flanagin & Metzger, 2001). The social situation surrounding the information that is processed is seen as more important than the attributes the media technology may possess. Fantasy football play may in fact be a social situation that creates or changes the needs an individual has for the mass media.

Rubin (2002) noted that viewers also engage in two different types of viewing habits to fulfill needs, ritualized and instrumental viewing. Ritualized viewing is using a medium habitually to consume time and for a diversion from everyday life. This type of viewing creates a less active and less goal-directed viewing state, although activity in the viewer still exists. Many football fans fall into this category, just habitually watching a game to see the outcome with little involvement. Instrumental use is seeking certain media content for informational reasons. This type of viewing is very active and purposive in nature. It suggests the key components of audience activity that was stated earlier: utility, intention, selectivity, and involvement. Windahl (1981) found different outcomes in these two types of viewing habits. He concluded that instrumental orientations may produce stronger attitudinal and behavioral effects than ritualized orientations because “instrumental orientations incorporate greater motivation to use and involvement with messages.” If fantasy football is creating a greater involvement in the media user, a user could be seen as using the media for more instrumental reasons rather than just ritualized viewing. This fantasy game could create needs within the user causing him or her to seek out other types of information from the media, and use different types of media to gratify these needs.

Denham (2004) suggests that if we assume that multiple social and psychological factors influence media enjoyment, then social norms and viewing situations are equally as important as content in perceived media enjoyment. Denham used televised football as a content source to make his argument. Although his argument about the viewing situation was that audiences would find different enjoyment based on whom they watched with, fantasy football creates another type of viewing situation. This situation

could create a more active and purposeful viewer who is more involved in the viewing process. This involvement and activity level may change the psychological needs within the viewer and create a different type of social event that has not yet been explored by researchers. This event is more than just friends watching a game. The fantasy game gives a purpose to watch and a reason to seek out information on the media. If a situational event such as fantasy football play could be found to affect the needs that one has for the media or media choices, broadcasters and mass media scholars could gain valuable information on how and why they should program certain events or what should be included in these events. For example, should more individual statistics be given to viewers during a television or radio broadcast? Do fantasy sports change the needs one has and thus the reason a fan uses the mass media? Even if these questions are not answered, it is clear that with newer communication technology, a sports fan today has a wider media choice to choose from in order to seek out certain types of information.

With newer technology emerging to gain sports information such as wireless internet or cell phones that can retrieve statistics and scores, many uses for the media now exist that can gratify a range of psychological and sociological needs. At the heart of this argument is interactivity and demassification of the audience. Heeter (1989) defined interactivity as a multidimensional concept: the amount of choice provided to users, the amount of effort a user must exert to access information, the responsiveness a medium is to its users, and the degree to which a media system facilitates interpersonal communication between specific users. On the other hand, demassification is the ability of the media user to select from a wide menu of choices (Ruggiero, 2000). With wider media options, the overall audience for a mass media source will shrink causing a



specific type of audience to flock to certain sources based on needs possessed. For example, history buffs will watch the history channel, individuals seeking sports news will tune to ESPN, and people needing more social conversation could tune to talk radio. This interactivity and demassification enable people to actively and easily select specific kinds of content and pacing to satisfy their particular needs (Flanagin & Metzger, 2001; Perse & Dunn, 1998).

In fantasy football play, the internet, as well as other technology, is creating more interactivity. Viewers can get instant statistics through web sites. Most online fantasy football sites now offer message boards to communicate with other fantasy players, as well as a trash talking section. In 2005, Yahoo began offering an 85 character line at the top of a teams' roster to leave "smack talk" for a team one was playing. If newer communication technology is in fact creating more interactivity and a demassification of audiences, trying to isolate and understand situations which may change how individuals use the mass media and for what reasons they use the media could be beneficial to both media professionals and mass media scholars.

Even though researchers have made strides in identifying and operationalizing psychological and sociological need variables, have created models for the uses and gratification approach, and have merged the uses and gratifications perspective with other models such as expectancy value theory and the social influence model of technology use, criticism still occurs (Ruggiero, 2000). First, the research is criticized since self-report data, which are still the primary measure of media use and gratifications sought and obtained, may not be measuring the individuals actual behavior so much as his or her awareness and interpretation of behavior. A second criticism is that it is too

individualistic, making it difficult to explain or predict beyond the individuals under study. Finally, there still exists a lack of clarity among concepts such as social and psychological needs, motives, behaviors, uses and gratifications. However, as Palmgreen and Rayburn (1985b) noted, to believe in the uses and gratifications paradigm, one must see the audience as active and accept that need gratification lies within the individual, understand that media competes with other sources for need fulfillment, and realize that media is secondary often to other sources, and have an understanding that people can report their motives. By taking this approach, a researcher must understand that media use is psychologically and sociologically based, be able to see the media audience as active communicators rather than just passive recipients of information, and see the media itself as functional in nature.

#### Sports Needs Research

The previous section touched on the psychological and sociological needs that exist for mass media usage. Equally important to this study is to look at the motivations individuals have to view sports in general. Engaging in sports media consumption should be looked at as a unique event because research has found that different types of programs are watched for different reasons. For example, television talk shows have been found to be watched for entertainment and for interpersonal interaction with others (Rubin, Haridakis & Eyal, 2003). Soap operas are watched for escape from everyday life, for social learning, for social excitement and simply for habit (Greenberg & Woods, 1999). A study on television news listed two basic reasons for viewing, to gain information about the external world which was labeled as cognitive orientation and to gain information to reflect upon or give context to the viewers' lives or social situation

which was labeled as surveillance-reassurance (Levy, 1978). Viewing a sporting event is unscripted where the final outcome is determined by athletes whose goal is to win a contest, so the motivation to view this type of program may be different than that of other programs. The following section will give a brief, conceptual definition of motivation, compare fans vs. spectators, compare trait vs. state and intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivation variables, and review current research on why people watch sporting events.

Motivation has been defined as a process that includes specific directive and stimulating properties that can lead to arousal and instigative behaviors, give direction and purpose to behaviors, allow behaviors to persist, and lead to choices of preferred behaviors (Christophel, 1990). Similar to uses and gratification research, motivations are based on social and psychological needs that exist within the individual (Trail, 2001). For sport fan research, we are interested in the stimulating properties that exist which lead to arousal for the sport. Several difficulties exist in the attempt to examine what motivates a sports fan.

The first difficulty is in the definition of a fan as opposed to a sports spectator. A spectator is one who views a sporting event with little or no emotional attachment, while a fan is defined as one who is enthusiastic about a particular sport or athlete and invests time, energy, and money into sports (Trail, 2001). A fan should have more motivation to view because more psychological needs may exist within this type of individual. It has been found that highly committed fans will continue their interest in an event, sport or team even after a game has actually ended. This interest has been found to consume parts of their every day life to a point where they will spend time searching for information or talking about an event, sport or team days after a contest. Spectators have been found to

simply watch a sporting event and then quickly forget what they have seen (Pooley, 1978). A study on the differences in uses and gratifications of sports between fantasy participants and nonparticipants should include questions to determine the degree to which an individual is a fan of that particular sport.

The second difficulty is that research has classified motivation into two distinct types: *Trait* or *state* motivation (Brophy, 1987). Trait motivation is a general, enduring predisposition toward sport, while state motivation is an attitude toward a specific game or sporting event (Christophel, 1990). For one situation an individual may be motivated by a state factor, but for another the motivation may come from a more enduring trait disposition. Trait vs. state motivation could be important to determine in this study because individuals who are high in trait motivation may have entirely different uses and receive entirely different gratifications from the viewing experience than individuals who are high in state motivation regardless of whether they play fantasy football or not.

A final difficulty in conceptualizing motivation is that the behaviors they produce can be seen as either intrinsic or extrinsic in nature. Intrinsically motivated behaviors are engaged for their own sake, for the pleasure and satisfaction derived from their application. Extrinsically motivated behaviors, on the other hand, are instrumental in nature. They are performed not out of personal interest but because they are believed to be instrumental to some separable consequence (Deci, 1991). This means that at times we may be a fan for the pleasure of sport, but at other times we may be motivated by extrinsic variables such as friends begging us to go to watch a game. We may watch the game for the companionship and to nourish an interpersonal relationship rather than because we really like the event. If an individual is motivated to play fantasy football or

to watch games intrinsically or extrinsically may be important to this study. A person who has intrinsic motivation towards football may use the media and receive different gratifications from the viewing experience than an individual who has extrinsic motivation regardless of whether they play fantasy football or not.

Although difficulties exist in the conceptual definition of motivation, there is no question that motivations are based on the psychological and sociological needs that exist in individuals. A need could be seen as something an individual seeks to feel well and good. Motivation then is a process in which psychological and sociological needs serve as stimulating properties that can lead to arousal and instigative behaviors, give direction and purpose to behaviors, allow behaviors to persist, and lead to choices of preferred behaviors. Just as researchers have attempted to understand the needs that exist to use the mass media, researchers have also examined needs that exist which motivate a person to watch sports in general. These needs have been examined using several scales to determine how motivated an individual is to consume sports. Recent scales have included the sport fan motivation scale (Wann, 1995), the motivations of the sport consumer scale (Milne & McDonald, 1999) and the motivation scale for sport consumption (Trail, Anderson & Fink, 2000).

Wann's sport fan motivation scale consists of 23-item Likert-type questions designed to measure possible needs that exist in sports fans. Wann found the scale to be internally consistent, normally distributed, and to possess strong test-retest reliability and criterion validity (Wann, 1995). Wann's scale found eight factors as to why individuals watch sports. These factors will be discussed in detail later, but include factors that Wann labeled as intrinsic needs which were aesthetics (beauty), eustress (positive stress) and

entertainment variables (as a pastime) and factors he labeled extrinsic needs which were self-esteem (feeling of accomplishment), escape (diversion from life), economic (gambling), group affiliation (to avoid alienation) and family variables (to spend time with family).

In a 1999 study, the sport fan motivation scale found that male subjects scored higher than females on the eustress (the need for positive stress) and self esteem subscales (the need to feel accomplishment), while females scored higher on the family subscale (the need to spend time with family). A difference was also observed in regards to sports type. As expected, those preferring individual sports as opposed to team sports scored higher on aesthetic motivation (the need for beauty), while those preferring team sports scored higher on eustress and escape motivation (the need for diversion from life) (Wann, Schrader, & Wilson, 1999).

Despite these findings, researchers have begun to question the use of the sport fan motivation scale. They comment on content validity problems that may exist, that is, the extent to which the items in the scale accurately represent the designated concepts (Trail & James, 2001). They argue that Wann has given no indication as to how the scale items were generated, whether or not a panel of experts was used, or how the final list of items was selected. Another problem noted is the wording of the items. Sometimes he asks questions about watching a favorite team, while other questions include the terms “read” and “discuss”. Trail and James (2001) claim that this makes the scale unclear as to what is being measured: watching sports, discussing sports, or reading about sports and the questions asked should be consistent across all motivation variables.

Wann admits to shortcomings in the sport fan motivation scale, but insists that it is a reliable method of measuring motivations. He goes on to suggest that the real problem may not lie in the scale, but in the individual being measured (Wann et al., 1999). For example, more research is needed to examine the relationship between fans' motivational perspectives and their level of identification with a team. If an individual feels a strong bond to a particular sports team, this may affect the motivation levels of the fan.

A second research need that Wann suggests is the ability to better understand the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of sports fans. One such distinction could be the idea of task oriented individuals vs. that of ego oriented ones (Duda & Nicholls, 1992). For example, in athletics, task-oriented athletes are those which are concerned with mastering a task in sport to improve one's ability. Ego-oriented athletes are concerned with the desire to be better than others. It would be interesting to see if fans fit this same basic mold. Similar to athletes, some fans may receive gratification from viewing by watching a team or individual improve. These fans may be interested in seeing their favorite team or athlete improve regardless whether they win or lose. This type of fan would be more intrinsically motivated to watch sports. However, other fans may be more extrinsically motivated, watching sports, not out of personal interest, but because it is believed to be instrumental to some separable consequence. This consequence would be winning, regardless of how this is achieved. Fantasy football creates an emotional and often times external reward for winning, so it may be found that the fantasy football participant is more likely to be motivated by extrinsic motivations such as winning or it may be found

that fantasy football participants are intrinsically motivated individuals who have a personal interest and a sincere desire to see their players improve.

A final research need Wann suggests could be the fans' belief in their team before a contest. Just as an athlete will have different motivations and behaviors if they perceive a successful outcome is forthcoming, so too should the fan. If the fan believes their team will have success, they should have higher intrinsic motivations to watch, feel confident that their team will have success, enjoy the contest to greater extremes, and believe their teams performance occurred because of successful effort if they win or because of external forces that were out of their control if they lose. On the other hand, a fan who lacks confidence in his or her team should prefer games that seem easier to compete in, have a low level of intrinsic motivations to watch, be more likely to doubt the teams chances to win, demonstrate a lower level of enjoyment, and blame success on outside factors while failure is simply a lack of ability. According to Wann, all of these considerations are important factors in contributing to the overall motivational levels of individuals, and should be addressed when using the sports fan motivational scale (Wann & Royalty, 2002).

The sport fan motivation scale is not the only scale researchers have used in an attempt to find the motivations of a sports fan. A second scale, the motivations of the sport consumer (MSC) was introduced by Milne and McDonald in 1999. After conducting a factor analysis on 37 Likert-type questions to measure motivation, this scale included twelve factors: risk-taking, stress reduction, aggression, affiliation, social facilitation, self-esteem, competition, achievement, skill mastery, aesthetics, value development, and self-actualization (Milne & McDonald, 1999). The strength of this



particular scale is the creation of even more specific subscales to measure sport fan motivations. The researchers wanted to be more specific in finding variables explaining why people watch sports.

Again, researchers have questioned the content validity of this scale as well. That is, does the scale seem to accurately represent designated concepts? This is because the MSC scale also measures motives for participation in sports rather than just motives to be a sports spectator (Trail & James, 2001; Mehus, 2005). This could lead to confusion for the subjects responding to the scale because some questions deal with watching sports while others deal with participating in sporting events. It also means that this scale may not be measuring the motivations of a sports fan in the same way as other scales that are theoretically similar to it. Overall, the usefulness of the MSC scale lies in its original items and categories from which a new instrument could be developed with better psychometric properties (Trail & James, 2001).

The scale which attempts to link the previous two scales together in achieving a valid and reliable source of measuring the needs of a sports fan is the Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption (MSSC). The MSSC consists of nine factors representing motives for following sports: achievement, acquisition of knowledge, aesthetics, drama/eustress, escape, family, physical attractiveness of participants, the quality of the physical skill of the participants and social interaction (Trail, et al., 2000). The scale attempts to incorporate the best aspects of the previous two scales and has provided reliability and validity checks (Trail & James, 2001). Because this is the latest of the three scales explored in this paper, the MSSC has yet to be challenged as an effective tool for measuring the motivation of sports fans. More research is needed using this scale to

determine its actual worth. The scale does seem to provide a good rationale of attempting to link the work of other two existing scales.

There are, however, factors that seem to be linked in all three of the scales presented that could be important in determining the needs that exist in a fantasy football participant as opposed to an average fan. Each factor will be listed with an explanation of current research that has been conducted.

### *Eustress*

The strongest motives for watching sports seem to be in the resolution of ambiguity and identification with competitors (Wenner & Gantz, 1989). Viewing takes place in order to see how a team or individual will perform or who will ultimately win a contest. These tend to combine with the enjoyment that comes with experiencing the “drama and tension” in watching a game, especially when it is close. This drama and tension the viewer feels is known as eustress.

Eustress is considered a positive form of stress that gives energy to an individual according to sports psychologists. Individuals motivated by eustress enjoy the excitement and anxiety that comes from watching a sporting event. The idea behind eustress has derived from suspense and drama theories.

Suspense theory emphasizes the role of uncertainty about outcomes in creating and sustaining curiosity (Berlyne, 1960). Using this theory it could be hypothesized that viewers should find it difficult to abandon close games because of the uncertainty of the outcome. A lopsided game would have little uncertainty and therefore would not be watched. Taking this theory into account could explain why television ratings are

generally higher for a closely contested game, or why spectators leave a sporting event early if they feel the outcome is for certain.

Closely related to suspense theory, drama theory makes similar predictions (Zillmann, 1991). Drama theory suggests that television viewers will not view a lopsided game because the resolution has been provided too early, thus rendering it unnecessary to watch and wait for resolution at the game's end. Close games, however, would be watched fully because only the end could provide resolution. The suspense effect has been found to be more predictable in sporting events where the fan was capable of drawing conclusions about the contest beforehand. For example, Sapolsky (1980) found no suspense effects when he let viewers from a different state watch a high school basketball game with no forewarning about the two teams that were involved. He had viewers watch either a closely contested game or a lopsided game and then record their enjoyment at the end. He found no suspense effects because enjoyment levels didn't change based on the closeness of the game. This was presumed to be because the students couldn't relate to the contest and it was rather irrelevant to them. Bryant, Rockwell, and Owns (1994) were more successful at finding a suspense effect when they gave salience to a match through commentary before letting an audience view it. They told the viewers either they would be watching a high school football game that would have playoff implications, or that they would be watching a meaningless, unimportant contest. Viewers who were told they were watching a game that would have playoff implications reported more enjoyment and excitement when watching and less boredom (Bryant et al, 1994). It appears that individuals enjoy a contest more if they know the game has some significance.

The need to experience eustress is different among males and females. Although both genders seem to be slightly motivated by this idea of eustress, males are more likely to state that they enjoy a close, exciting game. Gan, Tuggle, Mitrook, Coussement, and Zillmann (1997) took the idea of suspense theory into a study on gender differences in televised sports. They had students watch live broadcasts of eight games of the NCAA men's basketball tournament and then report their enjoyment of second-half play. They concluded that female spectators did not find the closely contested game particularly enjoyable. In fact, the findings showed that women, and especially women without a particularly strong interest in sports, were most irritated by closely contested matches. This irritation led to the feeling that the game was essentially unenjoyable. Males on the other hand were irritated the most by boring, lopsided contests.

People who play fantasy football may be more inclined to consume sports on the mass media for eustress. Fantasy players are adding a second level of competition and the outcome is uncertain until the final statistics are added up. This could create an individual who craves the excitement of watching or listening to his or her players perform and score points for their fantasy team or to watch the players of the competing fantasy team and root for them to do more poorly. This kind of positive stress could also cause a fantasy player to go online to search for stats or read an article about how a player might perform if they feel their fantasy game will be closely contested. Also, the idea of making a prediction as to what players will perform well in a given week could also add to the eustress of the viewer.

*Risk-taking.*

Along with the idea of watching close games, fans seem to enjoy a game more if they root for the winning team or simply make a prediction beforehand (Gan et al, 1997). By making a prediction on the outcome, stress is created because there is a possibility that the prediction could be wrong. Fans tend to watch closer and root harder for the team when a prediction is made before the contest begins because a certain amount of risk has been created. Although the risk may be small, such as just being incorrect in a pick, the amount of risk could be enhanced if money was on the line for a correct pick.

Related closely with making predictions beforehand is the idea of gambling on sports. Gambling is another reason why many sports fans are motivated to watch. The thrill and entertainment of betting on an event and winning will drive some sports fans to continue this activity and watch games very closely. The thrill of having a chance to win or lose something on the outcome of a game increases the amount of risk involved in making a prediction and makes the viewing more enjoyable. This enjoyment draws people in to watch or listen to more sporting events. The gambling motive has been labeled as watching sports for an economic motivation by some researchers (Wann, 1995). This study will not just focus on gambling as a reason to watch sports, but rather a larger variable known as risk-taking. Fans may be just as motivated by a variety of other factors such as prizes or just being able to brag about being correct about a player's performance on a given week.

For some, fantasy football involves some sort of risk in order to play. Even leagues that exist for fun with no money paid in and no year end money or prizes could involve a risk for some players, if they are concerned about their self-esteem or pride if

they lose to others. It would be interesting to determine if individuals who play fantasy football are motivated by risk-taking variables, or if the fantasy player is not as concerned with being correct. If fantasy football creates a situation where one could feel like they've lost in a risk-taking venture, perhaps the risk-takers would not be as drawn to the fantasy game.

### *Self-esteem*

Some fans have been identified as watching or cheering on a team in order to feel better about themselves. For some it may be as simple as being correct in picking the winner, or being correct about who is going to have a big game that particular day. For others, the involvement may be there in order to vicariously compete through the team of their choice. Since viewing sports can be done at a distance, it is possible for an individual to construct a "no lose" situation in order to boost self esteem no matter the outcome (Branscombe & Wann, 1991). When a player or team does well, the fan shares the success and may feel himself/herself to be a contributing agent. By association with the success, they feel satisfaction and self-worth. During a loss, a fan is able to reduce feelings of association and come up with excuses as to why a player or team performed the way they did (Gantz, 1981). This way they are increasing self esteem when the team wins and neutralizing the effect for a loss. We have all seen the increase in merchandizing of a team or individual player that is successful during a given year, while unsuccessful teams and players generally do not have a boost in merchandizing. Many people like to associate ourselves with winners. Association with a team or individual that is not successful leads people to feel more negative self-esteem. In fantasy football, participants are given the opportunity to make an attempt to link themselves with

successful athletes. If a professional player does well, a fantasy owner experiences success through the game and may be more likely to link him or herself to that success. This could lead to a more positive feeling of self-esteem and could even change behaviors of the fantasy player. They may for instance purchase sports memorabilia of a player.

The main contributor to the self-esteem variable seems to be the idea of team identification. Some fans will feel strong bonds to a team while others will say they are a fan but not follow the team as closely. Team identification has been found to be a major predictor of affective reactions, aggression, arousal, and tendencies to increase or decrease associations with the target team (Wann & Dolan, 1994). All of these reactions are closely related to the idea of self-esteem that an individual feels while watching a game. Again, a fan will generally show more team identification when the team is winning, while disassociating themselves from the team during a losing season.

Hirt, Zillman, Erickson, and Kennedy labeled this type of fan as being one who has the tendency to bask in reflected glory (1992). According to the researchers, basking in reflected glory is the tendency of individuals to publicize their connection with others who are successful. In one study, the researchers found that Indiana University student's self reported moods and self-esteem were affected by the outcome of Indiana University's basketball team. The students were also found to publicly identify themselves more with the university and team after a win (Hirt et al, 1992). This basking in reflected glory could also occur for individual players. Since fantasy football could aid in the creation of parasocial relationships with players, some fans may feel a strong bond with individual players, watching the player more closely or buying the players

merchandise when they succeed and disassociating themselves from the player when they do not perform well.

Individuals who engage in fantasy football play may be the type of people who crave sports for self-esteem needs. Fantasy football gives the individual a sense of control in that in most leagues they choose through a draft which players will be on their team. Even if they participate in an online draft that chooses the team for them, they still have the opportunity to control which players will be participating in the fantasy game in a given week and which players will not. Because there is more control over the fantasy team, an individual should feel good about themselves when their team wins and feel bad when their team loses. Although they may be able to blame fantasy loses on external factors such as the weather their players were playing in, fantasy football should create a greater feeling of control which may have an impact on the self esteem of the viewer.

*Escape and entertainment factors*

Being a sports fan also serves as an escape and entertainment function from everyday life, which can be a pleasurable experience, particularly when one's player or team performs well (Gantz, 1981). Fans are allowed to vicariously experience the struggles and successes of an athlete with relatively low risk. If the team succeeds, the individual can feel a part of that success, while if the team fails, the individual can separate himself from the team, or blame the failure on some other uncontrollable act. This creates a fan who seeks sports just as an escape from everyday life or as entertainment.

In one study, Gantz (1981) had students indicate not only the type of sports they enjoy watching on television, but also the motivations behind why they watched. He



found that competitive sports such as baseball, football, hockey, and tennis had both escape and entertainment motivating variables. The motivators fans expressed as being important were “I feel good when my team wins,” “to see who wins,” “I enjoy rooting for my team”, and “to let off steam”. These variables represent an escape or entertainment aspect of motivation which Gantz labeled as “to thrill in victory”. This suggests that people watch in order to root, to vicariously participate in the resolution process, and to experience the emotional satisfactions of winning (Gantz, 1981).

In fantasy football play, it would be interesting to see the level of motivation to watch based on entertainment or escape variables. Perhaps a fantasy football player finds more entertainment in games and enjoys rooting harder for players when playing the fantasy game, or perhaps their level of motivation to watch for entertainment or escape is less because they cannot enjoy the contest as much because the outcome also affects their own personal fantasy game. The average fan has the ability to separate themselves more from the actual game since little is won or lost in the outcome. Even though fantasy football gives an individual a sense of control in picking players that they think will perform well, in reality psychological or actual rewards and punishments are based on the outcomes of individuals that the fantasy player has no control over. These rewards and punishments may make it more difficult for the individual to separate themselves from poor player performances and actually contribute to less entertainment and escape for the viewer.

### *Knowledge*

Some are not drawn to sports to pick a winner or loser, or for the entertainment value, but rather to gain information. These people are the ones who bask in talking about

who won or what individuals did well the previous day at the water fountain. The need to acquire knowledge is a basic human trait and is anchored not so much in an extant identity with players or teams, but in the acquisition about basic information about both (Wenner & Gantz, 1989). These people may not watch the game closely, but are sure to catch the final outcome and the many highlights later run on various news and sports information channels. Fans who are anchored by knowledge acquisition are generally low in team identification. They watch more for the exchange of information rather than to root on a specific team. Many people have had an experience with someone who says, “Hey, did you see that game last night. That last play was unbelievable.” In our society, knowledge is generally viewed as power, even for the sports fan.

Although Wenner and Gantz (1989) stated that some individuals are more interested in the acquisition of information rather than identifying with a player or team, fantasy football may inspire an individual to do both. Not only could an individual follow a player, but they would also crave information about the particular player. The more knowledge a fantasy participant has about a player, the greater the chance that their fantasy team will succeed. For example, knowing the injury status of a player, how they generally perform against that week’s opponent, the overall health and ranking of the opposing team could all lead to a fantasy player’s success. Even having knowledge of the weather conditions could help in getting a fantasy win. Wenner and Gantz (1989) found that the individual who has the need to gain sports knowledge is the type who likes to talk to others about a particular game or play. Fantasy football gives individuals more reasons to talk and gain knowledge. Not only could there be discussions about the actual football game, but discussions about the fantasy contest would lead to talk about who won or who

lost, what individual players performed well, or even recent trends to determine which players have been doing better recently and which players have done worse. It could be that the fantasy player is less likely to view sports for general entertainment, but would crave statistics and information from the mass media on individual players rather than team information.

### *Aesthetic value*

Some fans seem to be drawn to sports because of the aesthetic value of athletic events. These fans are attracted to the beauty and grace found in athletic performances. Just like in the eustress motivator, there seems to be a gender difference in fans motivated by aesthetic values. Males are drawn to sport and seek gratification mostly from seeing athletic confrontations that emphasize combative coordination such as football, ice hockey, boxing and karate whereas women are more gratified when seeing competition that avoids overt aggressiveness and highlights the stylish movement of individual bodies in terms of beauty such as gymnastics, skiing, diving and figure skating (Sargent, Zillmann, & James, 1998).

Sargent, Zillmann, and James (1998) found that most sporting events could be classified into three types: Type I, consisting of combative sports, were characterized by direct physical contact between performers. Combative sports feature confrontations in which one party wins at the expense of an opposing party. Sports of this type were considered to be football, hockey, basketball, soccer, baseball, boxing and karate. Type II consists of stylistic sports which are characterized as those striving for “perfection of form” Such sports emphasize beauty and elegance of the body position and movement but also stress speed, agility and strength. These sports do not involve immediate physical

contact between competitors, and the quality of performance in competitions tends to be scored in rankings rather than in one-winner/one-loser fashion. Sports of this type were considered to be gymnastics, skiing, diving, figure skating, swimming, tennis and aerobics. Finally, Type III were considered mechanized sports which were characterized by tool use. The usage may serve to impart motion on an object, move objects, or set performers themselves into motion. Mechanized sports emphasize planned action, patience and hand-to-eye coordination. Again, there is no immediate physical contact between competitors, and the performance is usually scored in rankings, rather than a winner or loser. Sports of this type were considered to be fishing, golf, polo, archery, hang gliding, mountain biking, rock climbing, scuba diving, whitewater rafting, hunting, and auto racing.

Sargent et al. concluded that direct gender comparisons showed men to watch more violent combative sports featuring individual confrontations and women to watch markedly more elegant stylistic sports. They also found that male respondents reported the most enjoyment for watching violent combative sports and females reported the most enjoyment for elegant stylistic sports. This difference may suggest that women are motivated more by the aesthetic value found in a sporting event than are men. Little difference was found between men and women in viewing habits and enjoyment of mechanized sports. In fact, both men and women found the least enjoyment in nonrisky mechanized sports.

Since football in general is considered a combative sport, research indicates that if fantasy football participants are motivated by aesthetic variables they should be motivated by combative coordination rather than the grace and beauty of the sport.

Because aesthetic motivation variables generally involve questions about the grace and beauty of athletic competition and athletes, aesthetic motivation among fantasy football participants may be low. Also, since men are more drawn to combative sports, this could explain why the majority of fantasy football participants are male.

#### *Group affiliation and family*

Research has also found support for the idea of social interaction and family interaction as motivations for watching sports. Gantz (1981) found that some sports tend to lend themselves to being viewed in a group setting when watching them on television. Football and tennis seemed to rank high in the motivation variable to be with other people. He found that these sports tended to be viewed because “it’s something to do with my family when I get home”, “it’s something to do with my friends”, and “it gives me an opportunity to have a few beers or drinks”. These are social and family variables to why we watch sports which Gantz labeled as “to let loose”. This suggests that we watch sports to experience a social environment that may aid in the need to feel wanted by family or friends.

Gender makes a difference in viewing with family and friends. Women are more likely than men to watch because friends or family were watching and because it gave them “something to do” with friends or family (Gantz & Wenner, 1991). Men also seemed to be motivated by friends, but were more likely to list “having a beer” rather than “spending time with friends”. Since having a beer is not necessarily a social event, women may be more likely to want to view sports on television with family or friends than men are.

Fantasy football may be found to give a viewer another way to connect with family and friends. Many fantasy leagues that exist are made up of friends or family that play against each other. The competitive nature of the game lends itself to being viewed together. If a fantasy player is playing his/her fantasy game against a friend or family member, it could be more enjoyable to watch the game with that friend or family member. In a way, fantasy football gives an extra chance for individuals to socialize and enjoy competition involving sports without the physical interactions that most sports have.

#### Research Questions

Based on the literature review, a number of research questions involving the uses and gratification of the mass media between fantasy football participants and non fantasy football participants have emerged. Before these questions are proposed, it is important to account for the effects of perceived sport fan identification. For example, it would be inaccurate to assume that an individual who is a die hard sports fan would use the media and experience needs the same way as an individual who has a mild interest in sports. Wann and Royalty (2002) found team identification had an effect on emotional responses following a team's performance. In other words, those attached to a team would feel differently both before and after a team's contest. Wann (2002) suggested of equal importance is to be able to accurately assess the degree to which an individual categorizes themselves as a sport fan. Since fantasy football involves multiple players on multiple teams, accounting for the effects of sports fandom would be of greater importance than team identification. To include this variable, Wann's (2002) sports fandom questionnaire will be used.

The first research question has to do with the amount of media use of fantasy football players compared to football fans who are not fantasy players. Popular research has led us to believe that fantasy sports have an impact on media use. Specifically fantasy football fans watch more sports than fans who are not fantasy players and log onto the internet more frequently (Cox, 2002). However, this was an online survey. This behavioral difference has not been explored in a systematic, scholarly manner. So the first question this study explores is this:

RQ1: Do NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues consume more sports media than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues?

The next research questions have to do with the audience member's level of activity. Audience activity has been noted as an important variable in determining media effects (Rubin & Perse, 1987b). Blumler (1979) identified utility, intentionality and selectivity to be important in audience activity. Utility is a person's reasons or motivations to watch. Intentionality is the purposive or planned nature to watch. Selectivity is the choice one is given to watch, which is based on prior interests and desires.

In order to determine the activity level of the viewer, this study will use pre-exposure selectivity and involvement as variables. Preexposure selectivity represents an audience member's intention to use the media. Involvement will be considered as a three part dimension consisting of affective, cognitive, and behavioral variables as suggested by Rubin and Perse (1987a). Using these concepts, the study will attempt to answer the following research questions:

RQ2: Do NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater pre-exposure selectivity of media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football?

RQ3: Do NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater involvement in media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football?

Ritualized viewing was defined by Rubin (2002) as using a medium habitually to consume time and for a diversion from everyday life. This type of viewing has very little purpose other than to consume time. On the other hand, instrumental viewing was defined as seeking certain media content for informational reasons. This type of viewing is very active and purposive in nature. As stated earlier, it suggests that the viewer would have a greater amount of pre-exposure selectivity and involvement in the content. Because fantasy football play is based on individual player statistics, it may create a situation where a media user will attempt to seek out statistics and information on the players that they have on their fantasy team. If this happens, a media user would be very active and have purpose for choosing media.

RQ4: Do NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater instrumental viewing patterns in media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football?



RQ5: Do NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report less ritualistic viewing patterns in media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football?

The final research question has to do with the gratifications an individual seeks through sports media. From a uses and gratifications perspective, media may gratify a host of individual psychological and sociological needs. Fantasy football play could increase or decrease certain needs an individual has for the media. For example, past research has indicated that higher involved individuals will show a greater need for knowledge and information. If fantasy football play creates a higher involved individual, this need may increase. Eustress is the positive stress individuals receive from watching a closely contested game. Fantasy football participants may experience increases in this need for eustress by adding a second unpredictable outcome, or perhaps fantasy football play decreases this need since more emphasis is placed on individual statistics. This study will also attempt to address the need for entertainment. Perhaps fantasy football increases the desire to be entertained by sports, or perhaps the fantasy game actually makes one need entertainment from sports less by providing a game to be entertained by, not necessarily the game itself. However, since this has not been explored previously, the study addressed the following question.

RQ6: What differences exist in gratifications received from the media by NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues compared to NFL fans who do not participate in fantasy football?

### Summary

The existing literature is helpful in examining current uses and gratification research as well as research on sports needs. The review of literature suggests that uses and gratification research has explored a variety of different directions. The review found considerable research in the areas of comparing media-use motives across media, linking these motives to media attitudes and behaviors, and examining social and psychological circumstances of media use. Although research has been done on such social and psychological circumstances such as loneliness, media deprivation, isolation, viewing environment and social activity, no research has examined sports viewing and how the introduction of fantasy football play may have an effect on the uses and gratifications of media.

Rosengren (1974) suggested that needs are a complex web which interact with personal characteristics and social environment. More research is needed on social situations such as fantasy football play to better understand how changes may occur in the uses and gratifications of the media user. The literature has explored the differences between various media, as well as the differences between various program types such as soap operas, news, and talk shows. Research is needed to determine media use and gratification when an outside social situation such as fantasy football is introduced. Ultimately it would be interesting to determine if the fantasy football phenomenon is changing the way a viewer uses media and the gratifications they receive from this media.

The next chapter will explain the methods that will be used to answer the research questions proposed. It will discuss the respondents, measures, and variables that will be

used in order to answer the research questions. The independent and dependent variables will be discussed as they relate to the research questions.

## Chapter 3

## Methods

The purpose of this chapter is to elaborate on the methods that were used to answer the research questions proposed in chapter two. In order to test the research questions presented in the previous chapter, data were collected on the media uses and gratifications individuals received while gathering information and entertainment about the National Football League (NFL). The purpose of this chapter is to detail the procedures that were used to collect those data.

*Respondents*

Two groups of NFL viewers were sampled for this study: NFL viewers who play fantasy football and NFL viewers who do not play fantasy football. The use of two sample groups allowed for comparisons between those who do and do not play fantasy football. The survey data used for this study were collected in the middle of January 2007 from two different introductory communication courses at a medium sized university in the mid west. In order to gain a larger N size from people who play fantasy football, participants in four fantasy football leagues were also recruited. Colleagues of the researcher participated in three of the leagues and agreed to hand out a written script (See Appendix A), letter of consent (See Appendix B) and survey to other participants in the league. The fourth league was one that the researcher participated in. Each league contained ten participants. Forty surveys were distributed. Of the forty, only fifteen were completed and turned back to the researcher. None of the fifteen were college students.

Participants in the two introductory classes were read the script (see Appendix A). All participants in the study were asked to sign a letter of consent (see Appendix B)

before filling out the survey. Participants in the introductory class were given the surveys and asked to fill them out during the first fifteen minutes of a class period. The surveys were completed with pen or pencil and collected when everyone in the class had indicated they were finished. In the script that was read (See Appendix A), the participants were explained that participation was strictly voluntary and no grade or extra credit would be given. By just including NFL viewers in the sample, the study guaranteed that all individuals had some motivating factor to use the media for NFL content. Individuals who indicated that they have not viewed three NFL games either live or on the media in the past year were not included in either sample. Overall, the study included 50 participants and 153 nonparticipants in fantasy football leagues. All nonparticipants were students in the introductory communication course. Thirty-five fantasy football participants were students in the introductory communication course, while fifteen individuals were recruited for the study.

### *Measures*

A survey instrument was used to answer the research questions presented above. The survey included items to assess demographic variables, independent variables, and dependent variables. Participants completed 218 surveys. Of the surveys completed, fifteen were left out of analysis due to incomplete responses leaving a total of 203 for the statistical analysis.

*Demographic variables.* Previous research suggests that several demographic variables likely influence participation in fantasy football leagues and NFL viewing. Demographic information included gender, race, age, education, and family's annual income. Income was based on the yearly family income and was categorized in ten-

thousand dollar increments beginning with \$0-10,000 and ending with \$70,001+. Seventy thousand was chosen because popular research indicates that most fantasy participants have an income level of over \$70,000 (Beason, 2004). Educational level was determined by having respondents choose their highest level of school completion off the following list: no high school degree, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, some post graduate, and graduate degree.

Participants averaged 21.2 years old (median = 20 years) and ranged from 18 to 54, were 64% male (n=130) and 89% white (n=180). The sample was somewhat well educated. Overall, 13% were high school graduates (n=27), 82% had attended some college (n=167), 3% were college graduates (n=7), 1% had some post graduate work (n=1), and 1% had a graduate degree (n=1). Family income levels varied with 3% making less than \$10,000 (n=6), 5% making between \$10,001-\$20,000 (n=11), 7% making between \$20,001-\$30,000 (n=14), 12% making between \$30,001-\$40,000 (n=24), 15% making between \$40,001-\$50,000 (n=31), 12% making between \$50,001-\$60,000 (n=24), 8% making between \$60,001-\$70,000, and 32% making over \$70,001 (n=65). The sample contained 25% who participate in a fantasy football league (n=50) and 75% who do not (n=153). This proportion of fantasy football participants is higher than the national average, but not surprising since some individuals were recruited for the study from fantasy football leagues.

Fantasy football participants had a mean age of 24.3 years of age; sd 9.14 compared to nonparticipants who had a mean age of 20.18; sd = 2.84. A t-test was run to show a significant statistical difference between the ages  $t = 4.90$ ,  $p < .01$ . The difference in age likely comes from the fact that fifteen fantasy participants were recruited and were

not college students. Fantasy football participants had an average fandom score of 21.44;  $sd = 2.87$  compared to nonparticipants who had an average fandom score of 17.95;  $sd = 4.74$ . A t-test was run to show a significant statistical difference between the fandom scores  $t = 4.91$ ,  $p < .01$ . Fantasy football participants were predominantly male (92%;  $N = 46$ ) compared to nonparticipants (55% male;  $N = 84$ ). The high percentage of males as fantasy football participants was expected since previous research has found most fantasy participants to be male. Other demographics of fantasy football participants were very similar to nonparticipants. Fantasy football participants and nonparticipants were both predominantly white ( $f = 94\%$ ;  $nf = 87\%$ ), had at least some college education ( $f = 90\%$ ;  $nf = 86\%$ ) and had a similar percentage of family annual income of over \$70,000 ( $f = 42\%$ ;  $nf = 29\%$ ).

Research conducted by Beason (2004) indicates that the average fantasy sports participant is a college educated male whose household income is above \$70,000. However, this research was conducted with members of the Fantasy Sports Trade Association who charge a fee for membership. Levy (2005) used a more systematic approach. Using a sample size of 1,179 individuals, Levy found that 97.9% of fantasy sports enthusiasts were male, 68.7% were college graduates or postgraduates, and 73% earned at least \$50,000 per year. In comparison, this study found that 92% ( $n = 46$ ) of fantasy players were male and 74% ( $n = 31$ ) had a family income of at least \$50,000. Only 10% ( $n = 5$ ) were college graduates or postgraduates, but this was expected since most data was collected in an introductory communication class at a Midwest university. Demographic questions can be viewed in appendix C section 10.

In order to compare fans who are similarly motivated to view sports, sport fandom identification was determined. *Sport fandom identification* is defined as one's self-perceptions as a sport fan (Wann, 2002). To account for this, Wann's (2002) sport fandom questionnaire was used. The sport fandom questionnaire is a five item measure that has been found to be normally distributed, internally consistent, reliable and valid, with  $\alpha = .96$ . Sport fandom identification was determined by adding the five item measure together and getting a score. The score range was between 5 and 25. The five-item sport fandom questionnaire, with  $\alpha = .91$ , in this study, can be found in Appendix C section 1.

*Independent variable.* The independent variable for this study is participation or non-participation in a fantasy football league. To measure participation, participants were asked if they currently participate in a fantasy football league where NFL players are chosen or assigned to their fantasy team. Participants then responded with either a yes or a no.

*Dependent variables.* This study used a questionnaire designed to determine differences in the amount of time spent consuming NFL media and in the amount of use and the gratifications individuals receive from media when consuming it for the NFL. In order to answer RQ1 concerning *time spent on NFL media*, use was determined by having the respondent self-report the number of hours they spend with various forms of media for NFL entertainment or information in a typical week during the NFL season. Specifically, it asked on an average week during the NFL season how many hours do you spend reading a daily newspaper, reading a magazine, using a wireless service, using internet websites, watching television, and listening to the radio to gain information or



entertainment about the NFL. The survey was distributed at the end of the season, so fans should be able to report their viewing habits rather easily. These questions can be found in Appendix C section 2.

RQ2 has to do with pre-exposure selectivity. Similar to a study by Lin (1993), *pre-exposure selectivity* was assessed by how often a respondent knows in advance what media outlet they are going to use for NFL consumption, how many NFL games are generally viewed during a week, and the degree to which a respondent feels they know when to tune to a media outlet for NFL consumption. Linn found this scale had an alpha of .68. Each question was rated on a one to five scale where one means never and five means very often. The scores were summed and averaged. The questions used for pre-exposure selectivity,  $\alpha = .84$  in this study, can be found in Appendix C section 3. A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Correlations for pre-exposure selectivity

|  | Know in advance<br>the media outlet<br>used | Know how many<br>games are available<br>to watch | Know when to find<br>information |
|--|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Know in advance<br>the media outlet<br>used      | 1   |  |                                  |
| Know how many<br>games are available<br>to watch | .618***                                     | 1  |                                  |
| Know when to find<br>information                 | .618***                                     | .650***  | 1                                |

\*\*\* $p < .001$

To answer RQ 3, *involvement* was measured by asking affective, cognitive, and behavioral involvement questions as suggested by Rubin and Perse (1987a). By using

these three involvement variables, this study should also be able to determine where the biggest differences exist, either in affective, cognitive, or behavioral involvement.

In order to gain a sense of *affective* involvement, Rubin (1985) suggests using the *parasocial interaction scale*. For this study, the parasocial interaction scale was adapted to television sports (Rubin, et al., 1985). The parasocial interaction scale is a 20-item scale reflecting perceptions of and dispositions toward a favorite newscaster. Rubin, et al (1985) found this scale to contain an alpha of .93. They later revised this scale for soap opera viewing containing 10 items with an alpha of .88 (Rubin & Perse, 1987a). For the purpose of this study, the parasocial interaction scale was reduced to ten items reflecting perceptions of and dispositions toward a favorite NFL player. Just like with the soap opera study, ten items were deleted because they were not statements that would pertain to NFL viewing. For example, “When the newscasters joke around with one another, it makes the news easier to watch,” could not be adapted to NFL viewing because the players do not speak during the viewing of an NFL game. The scores of these ten items were added together and averaged. The parasocial interaction scale used,  $\alpha = .86$  in this study, can be found in Appendix C section 4. A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 2.

Cognitive involvement was assessed by adapting Rubin and Perse’s (1987a) *postviewing cognition scale* used for soap opera viewing to NFL viewing. Rubin and Perse (1987a) reported an alpha level of .86 on the four-item postviewing cognition scale. Respondents were asked to indicate on a one to five scale how much they think about what happened in an NFL game after viewing, how much they think about individual player performances after viewing, how much they try to predict what will happen in next

Table 2: Correlations for affective involvement

|                           | Like friends | Down to earth | Understands things | Look forward to watching | Miss seeing player | Find player attractive | Would follow another team | Meet player | Feel sorry for player | Read story about player |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Like friends              | 1            |               |                    |                          |                    |                        |                           |             |                       |                         |
| Down to earth             | .422***      | 1             |                    |                          |                    |                        |                           |             |                       |                         |
| Understands things        | .587***      | .609***       | 1                  |                          |                    |                        |                           |             |                       |                         |
| Look forward to watching  | .363***      | .468***       | .451***            | 1                        |                    |                        |                           |             |                       |                         |
| Miss seeing player        | .361***      | .381***       | .368***            | .607***                  | 1                  |                        |                           |             |                       |                         |
| Find player attractive    | .160*        | .181**        | .157*              | .169*                    | .244***            | 1                      |                           |             |                       |                         |
| Would follow another team | .317***      | .322***       | .416***            | .379***                  | .386***            | .135                   | 1                         |             |                       |                         |
| Meet player               | .381***      | .501***       | .423***            | .660***                  | .495***            | .144*                  | .389***                   | 1           |                       |                         |
| Feel sorry for player     | .355***      | .438***       | .391***            | .436***                  | .533***            | .411***                | .384***                   | .464***     | 1                     |                         |
| Read story about player   | .309***      | .446***       | .407***            | .685***                  | .488***            | .166*                  | .339***                   | .750***     | .497***               | 1                       |

\*\*\*p<.001, \*\*p<.01, \*p<.05

week's games, and how much they think about individual NFL players. The scores of these four items were summed and averaged. The four item postviewing cognition scale used,  $\alpha = .84$  in this study, can be found in Appendix C section 4. A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Correlations for cognitive involvement

|                                      | I think about<br>the game | I predict what<br>will happen | I think about<br>plays | I think about<br>players<br>involved |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| I think about<br>the game            | 1                         |                               |                        |                                      |
| I predict what<br>will happen        | .572***                   | 1                             |                        |                                      |
| I think about<br>plays               | .580***                   | .516***                       | 1                      |                                      |
| I think about<br>players<br>involved | .603***                   | .539***                       | .630***                | 1                                    |

\*\*\*p<.001

Behavioral involvement was assessed by adapting Rubin and Perse's (1987a) *postviewing discussion scale* used for soap opera viewing to NFL viewing. Rubin and Perse (1987a) reported an alpha level of .89 on the three-item postviewing discussion scale. Respondents were asked their agreement with three statements on a one to five scale after they watched an NFL game. The questions are: Do you talk about the previous weeks NFL games with others, do you talk about individual player performances with others, and do you talk to others to try to predict what will happen in the next week's games. The scores of these three items were summed and averaged. The three item postviewing discussion scale used,  $\alpha = .84$  in this study, can be found in Appendix C section 4. A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 4.

Table 4: Correlations for behavioral involvement

|  | I will talk to others | I will talk to predict what happens next | I will talk about individual players |
|--|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| I will talk to others                    | 1                     |  |                                      |
| I will talk to predict what happens next | .673***               | 1  |                                      |
| I will talk about individual players     | .648***               | .633***                                  | 1                                    |

\*\*\*p<.001

To answer RQ 4 and 5, instrumental and ritualistic viewing motives was determined by using Rubin and Perse's (1987a) viewing motivation scale adapted to NFL viewing. The original scale contains 30 reasons for watching daytime soap operas. This scale was adapted to NFL viewing. Five voyeurism questions were deleted from the original soap opera scale. These questions were questions of sexual arousal, character attractiveness, and viewing for sexual appeal. Because media use motives have been found to be interrelated and consistent with other studies involving instrumental and ritualistic viewing (Perse, 1986; Rubin & Kim, 1997; Rubin & Perse, 1987a) a factor analysis was conducted on the 25 variables via principal axis analysis with varimax rotation. A factor needed a minimum eigenvalue of 1.0. Similar to the other studies (Perse, 1986; Rubin & Kim, 1997; Rubin & Perse, 1987a), the analysis identified six factors that explained 58.2% of the total variance. The primary loadings in the factor solutions are summarized in Table 5. These questions can be found in Appendix C section 5.

Table 5: NFL Viewing Motivation Factor Loadings

| I Watch the NFL Because...                       | Viewing Motive Factors |       |      |      |      |      |
|--|------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|
|  | EXCT                   | PASS  | INFO | COMP | EXCP | SOCL |
| <b>Exciting Entertainment</b>                    |                        |       |      |      |      |      |
| It entertains me                                 | .92                    | .02   | -.08 | .04  | .06  | .07  |
| It's enjoyable                                   | .89                    | -.10  | -.03 | -.06 | .11  | .09  |
| It's exciting                                    | .78                    | -.12  | .15  | .02  | .30  | .03  |
| It's thrilling                                   | .77                    | -.22  | .18  | .02  | .17  | .01  |
| I just like to watch                             | .72                    | .08   | -.01 | -.04 | .23  | .02  |
| It's like a habit                                | .64                    | .18   | .30  | .03  | .09  | .15  |
| For new information                              | .59                    | -.10  | .44  | .01  | -.08 | .15  |
| It amuses me                                     | .52                    | .30   | .15  | -.08 | .41  | -.01 |
| <b>Pass Time</b>                                 |                        |       |      |      |      |      |
| To occupy my time                                | .06                    | .78   | .07  | .15  | .03  | .17  |
| To pass time away                                | -.11                   | .66   | .06  | .26  | .11  | .02  |
| There's nothing better to do                     | -.26                   | .59   | .09  | .27  | -.06 | .13  |
| Because it's on                                  | .06                    | .52   | .17  | .00  | .05  | .09  |
| To forget about work or things                   | .22                    | .40   | .32  | .29  | .11  | .31  |
| <b>Information</b>                               |                        |       |      |      |      |      |
| To learn things about myself and Others          | .11                    | .10   | .68  | .25  | .13  | -.05 |
| To learn how to do things I haven't done         | .01                    | .17   | .62  | .33  | .17  | -.09 |
| It makes me feel less lonely                     | .10                    | .31   | .57  | .38  | .11  | -.09 |
| To talk with others about what's On              | .30                    | .16   | .53  | .04  | .13  | .36  |
| <b>Companionship</b>                             |                        |       |      |      |      |      |
| To get away from others                          | .03                    | .19   | .09  | .81  | .14  | -.01 |
| So I won't have to be alone                      | -.03                   | .16   | .33  | .65  | .12  | .01  |
| Because I have no one else to talk to or be with | -.10                   | .20   | .32  | .63  | .10  | .04  |
| <b>Escape</b>                                    |                        |       |      |      |      |      |
| It relaxes me                                    | .24                    | .03   | .08  | .29  | .70  | .16  |
| It's a pleasant rest                             | .30                    | .11   | .18  | .09  | .65  | .05  |
| To unwind  | .36                    | -.02  | .23  | .23  | .51  | .31  |
| <b>Social Utility</b>                            |                        |       |      |      |      |      |
| It's something to do with friends                | .41                    | .14   | -.04 | -.04 | .07  | .54  |
| To be with others                                | -.03                   | .23   | -.03 | .00  | .13  | .42  |
| Number of items                                  | 8                      | 5     | 4    | 3    | 3    | 2    |
| Percent of variance                              | 19.70                  | 10.64 | 9.19 | 7.25 | 6.55 | 3.37 |
| Alpha  | .90                    | .78   | .78  | .82  | .81  | .45  |

Note: EXCT = Exciting Entertainment, PASS = Pass Time, INFO = Information, COMP = Companionship, EXCP = Escape, SOCL = Social Utility.

Factor 1, Exciting Entertainment, accounted for 20.34% of the total variance. Its eight items,  $\alpha = .90$ , mostly denoted seeking exciting or arousing entertainment. One item however was for information reasons (I watch the NFL for new information) and one was a habitual variable (I watch the NFL like a habit, something I do each week). A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 6.

Table 6: Correlations for Exciting Entertainment

| I watch the NFL...           | Because it entertains me | Because it is enjoyable | Because it is exciting | Because it's thrilling | Because I just like to watch | Because it is like a habit | For new information | Because it amuses me |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Because it entertains me     | 1                        |                         |                        |                        |                              |                            |                     |                      |
| Because it is enjoyable      | .845***                  | 1                       |                        |                        |                              |                            |                     |                      |
| Because it is exciting       | .717***                  | .725***                 | 1                      |                        |                              |                            |                     |                      |
| Because it's thrilling       | .684***                  | .705***                 | .762***                | 1                      |                              |                            |                     |                      |
| Because I just like to watch | .691***                  | .701***                 | .597***                | .567***                | 1                            |                            |                     |                      |
| Because it is like a habit   | .552***                  | .513***                 | .554***                | .547***                | .448***                      | 1                          |                     |                      |
| For new information          | .503***                  | .541***                 | .475***                | .545***                | .387***                      | .522***                    | 1                   |                      |
| Because it amuses me         | .495***                  | .479***                 | .496***                | .441***                | .548***                      | .451***                    | .288***             | 1                    |

\*\*\*p<.001

Factor 2, Pass Time, accounted for 9.45% of the variance. Its five items,  $\alpha = .78$ , focused on occupying time and to forget about work or things. A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 7.

Table 7: Correlations for Pass Time

| I watch the NFL...                    | To occupy my time | To pass time away | Because there is nothing better to do | Because it's on | To forget about work or things |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| To occupy my time                     | 1                 |                   |                                       |                 |                                |
| To pass time away                     | .593***           | 1                 |                                       |                 |                                |
| Because there is nothing better to do | .492***           | .462***           | 1                                     |                 |                                |
| Because it's on                       | .430***           | .408***           | .327***                               | 1               |                                |
| To forget about work or things        | .467***           | .313***           | .387***                               | .221**          | 1                              |

\*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$

Factor 3, Information, explained 9.17% of the variance. Its four items,  $\alpha = .78$ , focused on learning information with one being a companionship variable (I watch the NFL because it makes me feel less lonely). A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 8.

Factor 4, Companionship, explained 8.79% of the variance. Its three items,  $\alpha = .82$ , denoted reasons for watching to get away from others or to not be alone. A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 9.



Table 8: Correlations for Information

| I watch the NFL...                       | To learn things about myself and others | To learn how to do things I haven't done | Because it makes me feel less lonely | To talk with others about what's on |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| To learn things about myself and others  | 1                                       |  |                                      |                                     |
| To learn how to do things I haven't done | .661***                                 | 1  |                                      |                                     |
| Because it makes me feel less lonely     | .561***                                 | .495***                                  | 1                                    |                                     |
| To talk with others about what's on      | .400***                                 | .373***                                  | .359***                              | 1                                   |

\*\*\*p&lt;.001

Table 9: Correlations for Companionship

| I watch the NFL...                               | To get away from others | So I won't have to be alone | Because I have no one else to talk to or be with |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| To get away from others                          | 1                       |                             |  |
| So I won't have to be alone                      | .632***                 | 1                           |  |
| Because I have no one else to talk to or be with | .570***                 | .588***                     | 1  |

\*\*\*p&lt;.001

Factor 5, Escape, explained 6.77% of the variance. Its three items,  $\alpha = .81$  denoted rest and relaxation motives. A correlation analysis was run and is listed in Table 10.

Table 10: Correlations for Escape

| I watch the NFL...           | Because it relaxes me | Because it's a pleasant rest | To unwind |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| Because it relaxes me        | 1                     |                              |           |
| Because it's a pleasant rest | .587***               | 1                            |           |
| To unwind                    | .634***               | .522***                      | 1         |

\*\*\*p<.001

Factor 6, Social Utility explained 3.77% of the variance. The two items,  $\alpha = .45$ , were: I watch the NFL for something to do with others and I watch the NFL to be with others. Social Utility was not used in this study due to the low alpha.

As demonstrated in previous studies (Levy, 1978; Lin, 1993; McQuail, et al, 1972; Rubin 1983), the general approach to uses and gratifications research is to identify key needs that exist for using a particular medium. To answer RQ5, questions from both Trail's (2001) motivation scale for sports consumption and Wann's sport fan motivation scale (2002) were adapted and used to investigate why individuals use media for NFL consumption. Factors of escape/entertainment, knowledge/information, aesthetic value, and group/family affiliation from Trail's motivation scale for sports consumption and factors of eustress, risk taking and self esteem from Wann's sport fan motivation scale were all included for analysis in this study. Each factor had a three question item. Each factor was scored by using the sum of the three questions and averaging. Both scales have been found to be valid and reliable scales to measure sport fan motivation on various items. Trail (2001) reported an alpha of .87 on the motivational scale for sports consumption. Wann (2002) reported an alpha of .96 on the sports fan motivational scale.

For the purpose of this study, questions from both scales are being used in order to include the items that may be most important in our discussion of fantasy football. Since factors from both scales are being used, reliability tests were run to determine if common factors existed among the items. Eustress had an alpha of .75, risk-taking had an alpha of .87, self-esteem had an alpha of .64, escape had an alpha of .75, knowledge had an alpha of .88, aesthetics had an alpha of .90, and group affiliation had an alpha of .78. The questions used can be found in Appendix C section 6. The correlations can be found in the tables below.

Table 11: Correlations for Eustress

|                                    | I get pumped up when watching | It is physiologically arousing | I like the stimulation of watching |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| I get pumped up when watching      | 1                             |                                |                                    |
| It is physiologically arousing     | .397***                       | 1                              |                                    |
| I like the stimulation of watching | .516***                       | .587***                        | 1                                  |

\*\*\*p<.001

Table 12: Correlations for Risk-Taking

|                               | I get pumped up when watching | It is physiologically arousing | I like the stimulation of watching |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| It's enjoyable when I can bet | 1                             |                                |                                    |
| I watch so I can bet          | .667***                       | 1                              |                                    |
| Making wagers is enjoyable    | .673***                       | .724***                        | 1                                  |

\*\*\*p<.001

Table 13: Correlations for Knowledge

|                                       | I track statistics of players | I read box scores and stats regularly | I know the team's win/loss record |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| I track statistics of players         | 1                             |                                       |                                   |
| I read box scores and stats regularly | .791***                       | 1                                     |                                   |
| I know the team's win/loss record     | .667***                       | .680***                               | 1                                 |

\*\*\*p<.001

Table 14: Correlations for Self-Esteem

|   | I feel good when my team wins | My teams successes are mine and their losses are mine | Watching increases my self-esteem |
|---|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| I feel good when my team wins                         | 1                             |   |                                   |
| My teams successes are mine and their losses are mine | .330***                       | 1   |                                   |
| Watching increases my self-esteem                     | .255***                       | .514***   | 1                                 |

\*\*\*p<.001

Table 15: Correlations for Group Affiliation

|   | Gives me a chance to interact with others | Gives an opportunity to socialize with others | I like watching with family and friends |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gives me a chance to interact with others     | 1   |   |   |
| Gives an opportunity to socialize with others | .711***                                   | 1   |   |
| I like watching with family and friends       | .393***                                   | .506***                                       | 1                                       |

\*\*\*p<.001

Table 16: Correlations for Escape

|   | I can escape from day-to-day activities | Gives me something different to watch | NFL games are a great change of pace |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| I can escape from day-to-day activities | 1                                       |                                       |                                      |
| Gives me something different to watch   | .475***                                 | 1                                     |                                      |
| NFL games are a great change of pace    | .594***                                 | .430***                               | 1                                    |

\*\*\*p<.001

Table 17: Correlations for Aesthetics

|                                       | There is a certain beauty to the game | I appreciate the beauty of the game | I enjoy the gracefulness of the game |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| There is a certain beauty to the game | 1                                     |                                     |                                      |
| I appreciate the beauty of the game   | .798***                               | 1                                   |                                      |
| I enjoy the gracefulness of the game  | .707***                               | .720***                             | 1                                    |

\*\*\*p<.001

### Summary

This chapter has explained the methods that were used to answer the research questions proposed. It identified the respondents, measures, and variables that were used in order to answer the research questions. The independent and dependent variables were discussed as they relate to the research questions. In addition, viewing factor motivation loadings were reported as well as the correlations for each dependent variable. The following chapter will report the results of this study. It will report the correlations found

on all variables, the results of a demographic check on all dependent variables, and the overall results relating to the research questions.

## Chapter 4

### Results

A correlation analysis was run on all of the demographic, independent and dependent variables. Overall, the independent variables of fantasy football participation, gender and fandom were significantly correlated with many of the dependent variables. The demographic variables of race, education level, income level and age were not as frequently correlated with the dependent variables. The correlation analysis also suggests that media use variables are highly correlated with each other. For example, newspaper usage was highly correlated with the usage of magazines, wireless services, internet, television and radio. Both the motivational scales and the need scales were highly correlated as well. Finally, involvement variables and pre-exposure selectivity were highly correlated with the other dependent variables. The results are listed in Table 18.

Table 18: Correlations for All Variables

|                              | Mean  | sd   | 1      | 2      | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6      | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    |
|------------------------------|-------|------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Fantasy Participation     |       |      | 1      |        |       |       |       |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 2. Gender                    |       |      | .33**  | 1      |       |       |       |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 3. Fandom                    | 18.81 | 4.60 | -.33** | -.30** | 1     |       |       |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 4. Race                      |       |      | -.08   | -.07   | -.06  | 1     |       |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 5. Education                 |       |      | -.16*  | .07    | .01   | -.04  | 1     |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 6. Income                    |       |      | -.12   | -.16*  | .18*  | -.07  | .01   | 1      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 7. Age                       | 21.20 | 5.44 | -.33** | -.09   | .04   | .01   | .37** | -.20** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 8. Newspapers                | 1.17  | 1.40 | -.16*  | -.17*  | .31** | -.13  | .07   | -.09   | .03   | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 9. Magazines                 | .70   | 1.12 | -.13   | -.14   | .32** | -.05  | .03   | -.10   | -.03  | .68** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |
| 10. Wireless Service         | .33   | .92  | -.07   | -.05   | .16*  | -.08  | -.03  | -.05   | -.09  | .29** | .44** | 1     |       |       |       |       |
| 11. Internet                 | 1.76  | 2.89 | -.51** | -.30** | .34** | .07   | .11   | -.06   | .34** | .34** | .25** | .14** | 1     |       |       |       |
| 12. Television               | 6.21  | 4.80 | -.34** | -.33** | .40** | .11   | .04   | -.08   | .16*  | .27** | .23** | .06   | .51** | 1     |       |       |
| 13. Radio                    | 1.44  | 3.55 | -.20** | -.13   | .09   | -.02  | -.07  | -.06   | .11   | .24** | .23** | .23** | .15*  | .09   | 1     |       |
| 14. Pre-exposure selectivity | 3.69  | 1.06 | -.32** | -.35** | .52** | .02   | .11   | .06    | .09   | .33** | .25** | .11   | .35** | .46** | .14*  | 1     |
| 15. Affective Involvement    | 3.01  | .79  | -.23** | .03    | .48** | -.06  | .08   | .03    | .08   | .29** | .24** | .09   | .27** | .31** | .01   | .48** |
| 16. Cognitive Involvement    | 3.24  | .98  | -.33** | -.20** | .55** | .07   | .14*  | .08    | .11   | .27** | .27** | .10   | .32** | .44** | .05   | .60** |
| 17. Behavioral Involvement   | 3.66  | .99  | -.40** | -.22** | .56** | .03   | .12   | .11    | .09   | .27** | .28** | .12   | .34** | .47** | .14*  | .61** |
| 18. Excitement               | 3.74  | .83  | -.35** | -.31   | .64** | .06   | .03   | .12    | .04   | .33** | .29** | .15*  | .28** | .46** | .06   | .64** |
| 19. Pass Time                | 2.91  | .84  | .13    | -.04   | .01   | .00   | .01   | .06    | -.10  | .00   | -.01  | .06   | -.10  | -.16* | -.04  | -.05  |
| 20. Information              | 2.21  | .84  | -.06   | -.07   | .20** | -.02  | .11   | -.07   | .05   | .29** | .26** | .13   | .12   | .02   | .02   | .26** |
| 21. Companionship            | 1.75  | .79  | .04    | -.14*  | -.03  | .04   | .01   | -.07   | .07   | .16*  | .06   | .03   | .05   | .03   | -.02  | .04   |
| 22. Escape                   | 3.07  | .95  | -.14*  | -.18** | .25** | -.00  | -.03  | .10    | -.06  | .17*  | .17*  | .16*  | .13   | .17*  | -.11  | .37** |
| 23. Eustress                 | 3.07  | 1.01 | -.29** | -.22** | .43** | .05   | .13   | .12    | .09   | .29** | .25** | .17*  | .22** | .36** | .06   | .55** |
| 24. Risk-Taking              | 1.91  | 1.00 | -.00   | -.18*  | .02   | -.15* | -.05  | .13    | .01   | .14*  | .06   | .02   | .04   | -.11  | .14*  | .06   |
| 25. Self-Esteem              | 2.89  | .87  | -.28** | -.19** | .43** | -.06  | .13   | .06    | .14   | .29** | .21** | .09   | .37** | .33** | .08   | .49** |
| 26. Escape                   | 2.81  | .98  | -.21** | -.18*  | .23** | .07   | .04   | -.04   | .13   | .11   | .09   | .11   | .17*  | .19** | .12   | .39** |
| 27. Knowledge                | 2.95  | 1.27 | -.49** | -.44** | .59** | .03   | .12   | .12    | .16*  | .39** | .34** | .13   | .49** | .55** | .20** | .64** |
| 28. Aesthetics               | 3.09  | 1.10 | -.25** | -.21** | .43** | -.02  | .07   | .05    | .09   | .19** | .17*  | .15*  | .21** | .29** | .02   | .48** |
| 29. Group Affiliation        | 3.71  | .90  | -.27** | -.04   | .35** | .03   | .15*  | .11    | .03   | .16*  | .16*  | .09   | .18*  | .25** | .08   | .48** |

\*\*p<.01, \*p<.05



|                              | 15    | 16    | 17    | 18    | 19    | 20    | 21    | 22    | 23    | 24    | 25    | 26    | 27    | 28    | 29 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| 1. Fantasy Participation     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 2. Gender                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 3. Fandom                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 4. Race                      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 5. Education                 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 6. Income                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 7. Age                       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 8. Newspapers                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 9. Magazines                 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 10. Wireless Service         |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 11. Internet                 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 12. Television               |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 13. Radio                    |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 14. Pre-exposure selectivity |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 15. Affective Involvement    | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 16. Cognitive Involvement    | .66** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 17. Behavioral Involvement   | .66** | .82** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 18. Excitement               | .54** | .68** | .68** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 19. Pass Time                | .01   | -.01  | -.05  | .06   | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 20. Information              | .37** | .34** | .28** | .34** | .45** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 21. Companionship            | .09   | .05   | .01   | .05   | .46** | .54** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 22. Escape                   | .28** | .31** | .31** | .52** | .26** | .43** | .35** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 23. Eustress                 | .57** | .65** | .58** | .70** | .03   | .40** | .19** | .37** | 1     |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| 24. Risk-Taking              | .06   | .01   | .12   | .02   | .28** | .28** | .43** | .12   | .14*  | 1     |       |       |       |       |    |
| 25. Self-Esteem              | .56** | .58** | .57** | .55** | .14   | .46** | .29** | .35** | .68** | .19** | 1     |       |       |       |    |
| 26. Escape                   | .37** | .43** | .41** | .49** | .38** | .53** | .37** | .59** | .56** | .25** | .53** | 1     |       |       |    |
| 27. Knowledge                | .53** | .68** | .68** | .64** | -.10  | .30** | .07   | .27** | .63** | .16*  | .59** | .39** | 1     |       |    |
| 28. Aesthetics               | .53** | .56** | .51** | .57** | .02   | .34** | .05   | .37** | .67** | .01   | .54** | .45** | .54** | 1     |    |
| 29. Group Affiliation        | .45** | .50** | .56** | .64** | .11   | .36** | .06   | .39** | .61** | .04   | .53** | .57** | .40** | .45** | 1  |

\*\*p<.01, \*p<.05

*Demographic Check*

In order to determine if significant differences existed on any of the categorical demographic variables, oneway analyses of variance were used. These analyses were used to determine which demographic variables had a significant effect on the dependent variables and will be accounted for in the overall regression model to answer the research questions. All dependent variables were tested for differences based on each demographic variable of gender, race, education level, and family income.

For gender, there were significant differences in media usage for NFL information or entertainment for the dependent variables of hours spent per week with newspaper ( $F(1, 201) = 6.04$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .02$ ), hours spent reading a magazine ( $F(1, 200) = 4.11$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .05$ ), hours spent on the internet ( $F(1, 201) = 19.38$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .09$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and hours spent on television ( $F(1, 201) = 25.17$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .11$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Overall this indicates that men consumed more hours per week of NFL information or entertainment from newspapers ( $M_{men} = 1.35$ ,  $sd = 1.41$ ;  $M_{women} = .85$ ,  $sd = 1.32$ ), magazines ( $M_m = .82$ ,  $sd = 1.11$ ;  $M_w = .49$ ,  $sd = 1.09$ ), the internet ( $M_m = 2.40$ ,  $sd = 3.37$ ;  $M_w = .62$ ,  $sd = 1.03$ ) and television ( $M_m = 7.41$ ,  $sd = 4.95$ ;  $M_w = 4.08$ ,  $sd = 3.70$ ). However, no significant differences were found between men and women on hours spent on wireless services for NFL information or entertainment ( $F(1, 201) = .48$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .002$ ,  $p < .50$ , power = .11) and hours spent listening to radio ( $F(1, 201) = 3.55$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .07$ , power = .47).

Significant differences based on gender were found in preexposure selectivity ( $F(1, 199) = 26.97$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .12$ ,  $p < .01$ ), cognitive involvement ( $F(1, 201) = 8.56$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .04$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and behavioral involvement ( $F(1, 200) = 10.54$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .05$ ,

$p < .01$ ). Overall this indicates that men reported higher levels of selecting games to watch in advance ( $M_m = 3.97$ ,  $sd = .97$ ;  $M_w = 3.21$ ,  $sd = 1.03$ ), thinking about the game outside of the actual viewing experience ( $M_m = 3.39$ ,  $sd = .98$ ;  $M_w = 2.98$ ,  $sd = .93$ ) and talking to others after the game ( $M_m = 3.83$ ,  $sd = .99$ ;  $M_w = 3.37$ ,  $sd = .93$ ). However, no significant difference was found between men and women on affective involvement levels ( $F(1, 199) = .12$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .001$ ,  $p < .73$ ,  $\text{power} = .06$ ), their level of emotional attachment to individual players in the game.

For instrumental and ritualistic viewing habits, significant differences based on gender were found in watching for excitement ( $F(1, 201) = 21.94$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .10$ ,  $p < .01$ ), watching for companionship ( $F(1, 201) = 4.03$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and watching for escape ( $F(1, 202) = 7.00$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Overall this indicates that men are higher in perceived levels of watching for excitement ( $M_m = 3.93$ ,  $sd = .79$ ;  $M_w = 3.39$ ,  $sd = .80$ ), watching for companionship ( $M_m = 1.83$ ,  $sd = .84$ ;  $M_w = 1.60$ ,  $sd = .67$ ) and watching for escape ( $M_m = 3.20$ ,  $sd = .92$ ;  $M_w = 2.84$ ,  $sd = .97$ ). However, no significant difference was found between men and women in perceived levels of watching for information ( $F(1, 200) = .90$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .004$ ,  $p < .35$ ,  $\text{power} = .16$ ) and watching to pass time ( $F(1, 201) = .30$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .002$ ,  $p < .58$ ,  $\text{power} = .09$ ).

For need gratification, significant differences based on gender were found for the need for eustress ( $F(1, 200) = 10.13$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .05$ ,  $p < .01$ ), risk taking ( $F(1, 201) = 6.53$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .02$ ), self esteem ( $F(1, 201) = 7.35$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .04$ ,  $p < .01$ ), escape ( $F(1, 201) = 6.68$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .02$ ), knowledge ( $F(1, 201) = 47.18$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .19$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and aesthetics ( $F(1, 201) = 9.53$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .05$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Overall this indicates that men are higher in the need for positive stress ( $M_m = 3.23$ ,  $sd =$

1.00;  $M_w = 2.77$ ,  $sd = .97$ ), risk taking ( $M_m = 2.04$ ,  $sd = 1.08$ ;  $M_w = 1.68$ ,  $sd = .78$ ), self esteem ( $M_m = 3.01$ ,  $sd = .91$ ;  $M_w = 2.67$ ,  $sd = .77$ ), escape ( $M_m = 2.94$ ,  $sd = .95$ ;  $M_w = 2.58$ ,  $sd = .99$ ), knowledge ( $M_m = 3.37$ ,  $sd = 1.23$ ;  $M_w = 2.22$ ,  $sd = .95$ ) and beauty and grace of sports ( $M_m = 3.27$ ,  $sd = 1.12$ ;  $M_w = 2.78$ ,  $sd = 1.00$ ). However, no significant difference was found between men and women on the need for group belonging ( $F(1, 201) = .30$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .001$ ,  $p < .59$ ,  $\text{power} = .08$ ).

For race, no significant differences were found in the hours per week spent on NFL information or entertainment by reading a newspaper ( $F(5, 196) = .75$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .59$ ,  $\text{power} = .27$ ), reading a magazine ( $F(5, 196) = .43$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .83$ ,  $\text{power} = .16$ ), on wireless services ( $F(5, 196) = .44$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .83$ ,  $\text{power} = .17$ ), on the internet ( $F(5, 196) = .42$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .84$ ,  $\text{power} = .16$ ), watching television ( $F(5, 196) = 1.02$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .41$ ,  $\text{power} = .36$ ) and listening to the radio ( $F(5, 196) = .70$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .63$ ,  $\text{power} = .25$ ).

For preexposure selectivity and involvement, no significant differences were found based on race for preexposure selectivity ( $F(5, 194) = .75$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .59$ ,  $\text{power} = .27$ ), affective involvement ( $F(5, 194) = .22$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .96$ ,  $\text{power} = .10$ ), cognitive involvement ( $F(5, 196) = .86$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .51$ ,  $\text{power} = .31$ ) and behavioral involvement ( $F(5, 195) = .27$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .94$ ,  $\text{power} = .12$ ).

For ritualistic and instrumental viewing habits, no significant differences were found based on race for watching for excitement ( $F(5, 196) = .67$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .65$ ,  $\text{power} = .24$ ), watching for information ( $F(5, 195) = 1.37$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .24$ ,  $\text{power} = .48$ ), watching to pass time ( $F(5, 196) = .45$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .82$ ,  $\text{power} =$

.17), watching for companionship ( $F(5, 196) = .68$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .64$ , power = .24) and watching for escape ( $F(5, 195) = .30$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .92$ , power = .12).

For need gratification, a significant difference based on race was found for the need for risk taking ( $F(5, 196) = 2.71$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .07$ ,  $p < .03$ ). Overall, others had a mean of 2.83 (sd = 1.18), Blacks had a mean of 2.71 (sd = 1.47), Asians had a mean of 2.62 (sd = .80), Whites had a mean of 1.84 (sd = .94), American Indians had a mean of 1.75 (sd = .88) and Hispanics had a mean of 1.00 (sd = 0.0). However, no significant differences were found based on race and the need for eustress ( $F(5, 195) = .56$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .74$ , power = .20), self esteem ( $F(5, 196) = 1.02$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .41$ , power = .36), escape ( $F(5, 196) = .66$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .66$ , power = .24), knowledge ( $F(5, 196) = .27$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .93$ , power = .12), aesthetics ( $F(5, 196) = 1.00$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .43$ , power = .35), and group affiliation ( $F(5, 196) = .73$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .60$ , power = .26).

For Education, no significant differences were found in the hours per week spent on NFL information or entertainment by reading a newspaper ( $F(4, 198) = 1.26$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .29$ , power = .39), reading a magazine ( $F(4, 197) = .25$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .91$ , power = .10), on wireless services ( $F(4, 198) = .22$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .004$ ,  $p < .94$ , power = .10), on the internet ( $F(4, 198) = 1.46$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .22$ , power = .45), watching television ( $F(4, 198) = 1.69$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .16$ , power = .51) and listening to the radio ( $F(4, 198) = .98$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .42$ , power = .31).

For preexposure selectivity and involvement, no significant differences were found based on education levels for preexposure selectivity ( $F(4, 196) = 1.53$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .20$ , power = .47), affective involvement ( $F(4, 196) = 1.56$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .20$ , power = .47).

.19, power = .48), cognitive involvement ( $F(4, 198) = 1.71$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .15$ , power = .52) and behavioral involvement ( $F(4, 197) = 1.66$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .17$ , power = .50).

For ritualistic and instrumental viewing habits, no significant differences were found based on education levels for watching for excitement ( $F(4, 198) = .66$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .63$ , power = .21), watching for information ( $F(4, 197) = 1.21$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .31$ , power = .38), watching to pass time ( $F(4, 198) = .69$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .60$ , power = .22), watching for companionship ( $F(4, 198) = .29$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .88$ , power = .12) and watching for escape ( $F(4, 197) = .97$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .43$ , power = .31).

For need gratification, no significant differences were found based on educational levels and the need for eustress ( $F(4, 197) = 1.46$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .22$ , power = .45), risk taking ( $F(4, 198) = .85$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .50$ , power = .27), self esteem ( $F(4, 198) = 1.05$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .39$ , power = .33), escape ( $F(4, 198) = .82$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .52$ , power = .26), knowledge ( $F(4, 198) = .93$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .45$ , power = .29), aesthetics ( $F(4, 198) = 1.02$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .40$ , power = .32), and group affiliation ( $F(4, 198) = 1.60$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .18$ , power = .49).

For Income, no significant differences were found in the hours per week spent on NFL information or entertainment by reading a newspaper ( $F(7, 183) = .80$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .59$ , power = .34), reading a magazine ( $F(7, 183) = .85$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .55$ , power = .36), on wireless services ( $F(7, 183) = .97$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .04$ ,  $p < .46$ , power = .41), on the internet ( $F(7, 183) = .31$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .96$ , power = .14), watching

television ( $F(7, 183) = .66$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .71$ , power = .28) and listening to the radio ( $F(7, 183) = .32$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .95$ , power = .15).

For preexposure selectivity and involvement, no significant differences were found based on income levels for preexposure selectivity ( $F(7, 181) = .34$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .94$ , power = .15), affective involvement ( $F(7, 181) = .12$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .99$ , power = .08), cognitive involvement ( $F(7, 183) = .46$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .87$ , power = .52) and behavioral involvement ( $F(7, 182) = .85$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .56$ , power = .36).

For ritualistic and instrumental viewing habits, no significant differences were found based on income levels for watching for excitement ( $F(7, 183) = .71$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .67$ , power = .30), watching for information ( $F(7, 182) = .40$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .91$ , power = .18), watching to pass time ( $F(7, 183) = 1.07$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .04$ ,  $p < .39$ , power = .46), watching for companionship ( $F(7, 183) = .47$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .86$ , power = .20), and watching for escape ( $F(7, 182) = .38$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .92$ , power = .17).

For need gratification, no significant differences were found based on income levels and the need for eustress ( $F(7, 182) = .69$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .69$ , power = .29), risk taking ( $F(7, 183) = 1.37$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .05$ ,  $p < .23$ , power = .57), self esteem ( $F(7, 183) = .57$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .79$ , power = .24), escape ( $F(7, 183) = .56$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .80$ , power = .24), knowledge ( $F(7, 183) = .50$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .84$ , power = .21), aesthetics ( $F(7, 183) = .36$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .01$ ,  $p < .92$ , power = .16), and group affiliation ( $F(7, 183) = .60$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .76$ , power = .25).

To test for a significant relationship on the dependent variables and the continuous demographic variables of sport fandom identification and age, a series of regression were performed.

Sport fandom identification was found to be a significant predictor in hours spent per week for NFL information or entertainment by reading a newspaper ( $B = .09$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .10$ ), reading a magazine ( $B = .08$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .10$ ), using wireless service ( $B = .03$ ,  $p < .03$ ,  $R^2 = .03$ ), spending time on the internet ( $B = .21$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .11$ ) and watching television ( $B = .42$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .16$ ). This indicates that the greater the sport fandom identification, the more hours spent reading a newspaper ( $r = .31$ ), hours spent reading a magazine ( $r = .32$ ), hours spent on wireless service ( $r = .16$ ), hours spent on the internet ( $r = .34$ ) and hours spent watching television for NFL information or entertainment ( $r = .40$ ). Sport fandom identification was not a significant predictor of hours spent listening to the radio for NFL information or entertainment ( $B = .07$ ,  $p < .22$ )

For pre-exposure selectivity and involvement, sport fandom identification was found to be a significant predictor of pre-exposure selectivity ( $B = .12$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .27$ ), affective involvement ( $B = .08$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .23$ ), cognitive involvement ( $B = .12$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .30$ ) and behavioral involvement ( $B = .12$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .32$ ). Overall, this indicates that the greater the sport fandom identification the more likely to report selecting games to watch in advance ( $r = .52$ ), feel more emotionally attached to individual players in the game ( $r = .48$ ), think about the game outside of the actual viewing experience ( $r = .55$ ) and talk to others after the game ( $r = .56$ ).

For instrumental and ritualistic viewing habits, sport fandom identification was found to be a significant predictor in watching for excitement ( $B = .12$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 =$



.41), watching for information ( $B = .04$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $R^2 = .32$ ) and watching for escape ( $B = .05$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .06$ ). Overall this indicates that the higher the sport fandom identification, the higher in perceived levels of watching for excitement ( $r = .64$ ), watching for information ( $r = .20$ ) and watching for escape ( $r = .25$ ). However, sport fandom identification was not found to be a significant predictor in perceived levels of watching to pass time ( $B = .00$ ,  $p < .84$ ) and watching for companionship ( $B = -.01$ ,  $p < .69$ ).

For need gratification, sport fandom identification was found to be a significant predictor for the need for eustress ( $B = .09$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .18$ ), self esteem ( $B = .08$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .18$ ), escape ( $B = .05$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $R^2 = .05$ ), knowledge ( $B = .16$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .35$ ), aesthetics ( $B = .10$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .18$ ) and group belonging ( $B = .07$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .12$ ). Overall this indicates that the higher the sport fandom identification, the higher in the need for positive stress ( $r = .43$ ), self esteem ( $r = .43$ ), escape ( $r = .23$ ), knowledge ( $r = .59$ ), beauty and grace ( $r = .43$ ) and group belonging ( $r = .35$ ). However, sport fandom identification was not found to be a significant predictor on the need for risk taking ( $B = .00$ ,  $p < .83$ ).

Age was found to be a significant predictor in both hours spent on the internet for NFL information or entertainment ( $B = .18$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .12$ ) and hours spent watching television ( $B = .14$ ,  $p < .03$ ,  $R^2 = .03$ ). In both cases, this indicates that the older a person is the more time spent on the internet ( $r = .34$ ) and watching television for NFL information and entertainment ( $r = .16$ ). Age was not a significant predictor of hours spent reading a newspaper ( $B = .01$ ,  $p < .69$ ), hours spent reading a magazine ( $B = -.01$ ,  $p$

< .64), hours spent on wireless service ( $B = -.01, p < .20$ ) and hours spent listening to the radio for NFL information or entertainment ( $B = .07, p < .14$ ).

For pre-exposure selectivity and involvement, age was not a significant predictor of pre-exposure selectivity ( $B = .02, p < .20$ ), affective involvement ( $B = .01, p < .29$ ), cognitive involvement ( $B = .02, p < .12$ ) and behavioral involvement ( $B = .02, p < .21$ ).

For ritualistic and instrumental viewing habits, age was not a significant predictor of watching for excitement ( $B = .01, p < .59$ ), watching for information ( $B = .01, p < .49$ ), watching to pass time ( $B = -.02, p < .17$ ), watching for companionship ( $B = .01, p < .32$ ) and watching for escape ( $B = -.01, p < .42$ ).

For need gratification, age was found to be a significant predictor in the need for knowledge ( $B = .04, p < .03, R^2 = .03$ ). This indicates that the older a person is the greater the need for knowledge ( $r = .16$ ). Age was not a significant predictor of the need for eustress ( $B = .02, p < .19$ ), risk taking ( $B = .00, p < .88$ ), self esteem ( $B = .02, p < .06$ ), escape ( $B = .02, p < .07$ ), aesthetics ( $B = .02, p < .21$ ), and group affiliation ( $B = .01, p < .65$ ).

### *Summary*

Based on the differences found by each demographic variable, gender and sport fandom identification were included in the overall regression analyses that follow as independent variables. Gender showed significant differences in all but six of the 22 dependent variables used in this study. Sport fandom identification was a predictor in all but four of the 22 dependent variables. These results indicate that the two variables could have a significant effect on the dependent variables. In order to account for this potential effect on the results for the research questions, they were included in the regression

analysis along with fantasy football participation. Age, race, education and income were excluded from the analyses because the only significant differences found among the 22 dependent variables was for race on the need for risk-taking, and for age on hours spent on the internet, hours spent on television, and the need for knowledge.

### *Analysis*

To determine the answers to the research question proposed, several statistical tests were conducted. The results from the demographic check suggested three variables of interest as contextual factors that may influence media usage. Regression was used to examine the effects of sports fandom identification, gender, and fantasy participation or nonparticipation on the dependent variables.

### *RQ1: Fantasy Football Participation and Media Use*

To determine whether NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues consume more sports media than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues a series of regressions were performed, one for each media source of internet, television, radio, newspaper, and wireless services. In each of these regressions sports fandom identification, gender, and fantasy football participation were entered as independent variables. This made it possible to determine if each of these variables was a significant predictor of the dependent variable.

In the first regression, for hours spent on the internet for NFL information and entertainment per week, the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 28.55$ ,  $R^2 = .30$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .17$ ,  $p < .01$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification used the internet more hours per week for NFL information or entertainment ( $r = .34$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of

internet use ( $B = .11, p < .10$ ;  $M_{men} = 2.40, sd = 3.37$ ;  $M_{women} = .62, sd = 1.03$ ).

Results also indicated that fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of internet usage for NFL information or entertainment ( $B = .42, p < .001$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players used the internet an average of 4.33 ( $sd = 4.48$ ) hours per week, while nonparticipants used the internet an average of .92 ( $sd = 1.34$ ) hours per week. These overall results are reported in column 1 of Table 19.

In the second regression, for hours spent viewing television for NFL information and entertainment per week, the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 20.94, R^2 = .24, p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .29, p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification watched television more hours per week for NFL information or entertainment ( $r = .40$ ). Gender was also a significant predictor of television use for NFL information or entertainment ( $B = .19, p < .01$ ), with men reporting watching television more hours per week ( $M = 7.41, sd = 4.95$ ) than women ( $M = 4.08, sd = 3.70$ ). In addition to these two variables, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of television usage ( $B = .18, p < .01$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players watched television for NFL information or entertainment an average of 9.05 ( $sd = 5.47$ ) hours per week, while nonparticipants watched television an average of 5.28 ( $sd = 4.18$ ) hours per week. These overall results are reported in column 2 of Table 19.

In the third regression, for hours spent listening to the radio for NFL information and entertainment per week, the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 3.14, R^2 = .05, p < .03$ ). Fandom identification was not a significant predictor ( $B = .01, p < .91$ ). Also, gender was not a significant predictor of radio use for NFL information or entertainment

( $B = .07$ ,  $p < .35$ ;  $M_{men} = 1.79$ ,  $sd = 4.29$ ;  $M_{women} = .82$ ,  $sd = 1.28$ ). In contrast to these two variables, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of radio usage ( $B = .17$ ,  $p < .03$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players listened to the radio for NFL information or entertainment an average of 2.68 ( $sd = 6.34$ ) hours per week, while nonparticipants listened to the radio an average of 1.03 ( $sd = 1.75$ ) hours per week. These overall results are reported in column 3 of Table 19.

In the fourth regression, for hours spent reading a newspaper for NFL information and entertainment per week, the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 7.77$ ,  $R^2 = .11$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .27$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification read newspapers for NFL information or entertainment more hours per week ( $r = .31$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of newspaper use ( $B = .07$ ,  $p < .32$ ;  $M_{men} = 1.35$ ,  $sd = 1.41$ ;  $M_{women} = .85$ ,  $sd = 1.32$ ). Like gender, fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of newspaper usage for NFL information or entertainment ( $B = .05$ ,  $p < .51$ ;  $M_f = 1.57$ ,  $sd = 1.59$ ;  $M_{nf} = 1.04$ ,  $sd = 1.31$ ). These overall results are reported in column 4 of Table 19.

In the fifth regression, for hours spent reading magazines for NFL information and entertainment per week, the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 7.57$ ,  $R^2 = .10$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .30$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification read magazines for NFL information or entertainment more hours per week ( $r = .32$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of magazine use ( $B = .04$ ,  $p < .59$ ;  $M_{men} = .82$ ,  $sd = 1.11$ ;  $M_{women} = .49$ ,  $sd = 1.09$ ). Like gender, fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of

magazine usage for NFL information or entertainment ( $B = .02$ ,  $p < .77$ ;  $Mf = .96$ ,  $sd = 1.00$ ;  $Mnf = .62$ ,  $sd = 1.14$ ). These overall results are reported in column 5 of Table 19.

In the sixth regression, for hours spent on wireless services for NFL information and entertainment per week, the overall results were not significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 1.71$ ,  $R^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .17$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .15$ ,  $p < .05$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification use wireless services for NFL information or entertainment more hours per week ( $r = .16$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of wireless service use ( $B = -.004$ ,  $p < .96$ ;  $Mmen = .36$ ,  $sd = .88$ ;  $Mwomen = .27$ ,  $sd = .99$ ). Similarly, fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of wireless service usage for NFL information or entertainment ( $B = .02$ ,  $p < .77$ ;  $Mf = .44$ ,  $sd = 1.08$ ;  $Mnf = .29$ ,  $sd = .86$ ). These overall results are reported in column 6 of Table 19.

Table 19: Regression Coefficients for Media Use

|                       | Internet  | Television | Radio  | Newspaper | Magazine | Wireless |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Fandom Identification | .168**    | .288***    | .009   | .272***   | .297***  | .151*    |
| Gender                | .107      | .187**     | .071   | .073      | .040     | -.004    |
| Fantasy Participation | .418***   | .182**     | .174*  | .049      | .022     | .023     |
| R-square              | .301      | .240       | .045   | .105      | .103     | .025     |
| F-Value               | 28.553*** | 20.944***  | 3.137* | 7.770***  | 7.566*** | 1.713    |

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

For this study, when simultaneously examining the effects of sport fandom identification and gender, fantasy participation was a significant predictor of hours per week spent on the internet, watching television, and listening to the radio for NFL information or entertainment. This study found that when accounting for sport fandom identification and gender, fantasy participation was not a significant predictor of hours

per week spent reading a newspaper, reading a magazine, and using wireless services for NFL information or entertainment. The results appear to indicate that fantasy participants use more electronic media for NFL information or entertainment than fans who do not participate in fantasy football. However, no differences were found in the use of print media.

*RQ2: Fantasy football participation and pre-exposure selectivity*

Pre-exposure selectivity is defined as the advanced knowledge an individual has to select a certain game to watch. For example does the individual know the media outlet to use, do they know how many games are available, or do they know when the games are available. To determine whether NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater pre-exposure selectivity of media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues a regression was performed. In this regression sports fandom identification, gender and fantasy football participation were entered as independent variables in order to determine if each of these was a significant predictor of the dependent variable.

In the regression, for pre-exposure selectivity, the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 197} = 30.52$ ,  $R^2 = .32$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .42$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported more pre-exposure selectivity of media content pertaining to the NFL ( $r = .52$ ). Gender was also a significant predictor ( $B = .18$ ,  $p < .01$ ). As expected, men reported more pre-exposure selectivity of media content pertaining to the NFL ( $M = 3.97$ ,  $sd = .97$ ) than women ( $M = 3.21$ ,  $sd = 1.03$ ). In contrast to these two variables, fantasy football

participation was not a significant predictor of pre-exposure selectivity ( $B = .12, p < .08$ ;  $Mf = 4.27, sd = .78$ ;  $Mnf = 3.50, sd = 1.06$ ). These overall results are reported in column 1 of Table 20.

Overall for this study, while simultaneously accounting for the effects of sports fandom identification and gender, fantasy participation was not a significant predictor of pre-exposure selectivity of media content pertaining to the NFL. This suggests that fantasy participants and non-participants are about equal in their intentionality to use the media for NFL content.

*RQ 3: Fantasy football participation and involvement*

The third research question asked about involvement by looking at the three aspects of involvement separately: affective, cognitive and behavioral involvement. To determine whether NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater involvement in media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues, a series of regression were performed, one each for cognitive involvement, behavioral involvement, and affective involvement. In each of these regressions sports fandom identification, gender and fantasy football participation were entered as independent variables.

In the first regression, for cognitive involvement the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 32.30, R^2 = .33, p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .50, p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported higher levels of cognitive involvement ( $r = .55$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of cognitive involvement ( $B = -.001, p < .99$ ;  $Mmen = 3.39, sd = .98$ ;  $Mwomen = 2.98, sd = .93$ ). Results also indicate that fantasy football participation



was a significant predictor of levels of cognitive involvement ( $B = .16, p < .02$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average cognitive involvement level of 3.80 ( $sd = .62$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average cognitive involvement level of 3.06 ( $sd = 1.00$ ). These overall results are reported in column 2 of Table 20.

In the second regression, for behavioral involvement the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 198} = 38.10, R^2 = .37, p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .48, p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported higher levels of behavioral involvement ( $r = .56$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of behavioral involvement ( $B = .002, p < .98; M_{men} = 3.83, sd = .99; M_{women} = 3.37, sd = .93$ ). Results also indicated that fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of levels of behavioral involvement ( $B = .24, p < .001$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average behavioral involvement level of 4.35 ( $sd = .56$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average behavioral involvement level of 3.44 ( $sd = 1.00$ ). These overall results are reported in column 3 of Table 20.

In the third regression, for affective involvement the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 197} = 24.86, R^2 = .28, p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .50, p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported higher levels of affective involvement ( $r = .48$ ). Also, with women reporting slightly more affective involvement ( $M = 3.03, sd = .75$ ) than men ( $M = 2.99, sd = .81$ ), gender was a significant predictor of affective involvement ( $B = -.22, p < .001$ ). In addition to these two variables, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor

of levels of affective involvement ( $B = .14, p < .04$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average affective involvement level of 3.33 ( $sd = .63$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average affective involvement level of 2.90 ( $sd = .81$ ). These overall results are reported in column 4 of Table 20.

Table 20: Regression Coefficients for Pre-exposure Selectivity and Involvement

|                          | Pre-exposure<br>Selectivity | Cognitive<br>Involvement | Behavioral<br>Involvement | Affective<br>Involvement |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Fandom<br>Identification | .423***                     | .498***                  | .484***                   | .495***                  |
| Gender                   | .180**                      | -.001                    | .002                      | -.218***                 |
| Fantasy<br>Participation | .117                        | .164*                    | .238***                   | .142*                    |
| R-square                 | .317                        | .327                     | .366                      | .275                     |
| F-Value                  | 30.521***                   | 32.302***                | 38.103***                 | 24.861***                |

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

Overall, when simultaneously examining the effects of sport fandom identification and gender, this study found fantasy participation to be a significant predictor of higher cognitive, behavioral and affective levels of involvement.

*RQ4: Fantasy football participation and instrumental viewing*

Research question four involved instrumental viewing. To determine whether NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater instrumental viewing patterns in media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues a series of regressions were performed. Using the results from the factor analysis performed earlier, viewing the NFL for excitement and information were used as dependent variables. In each of these regressions sports fandom identification, gender and fantasy football participation were entered as independent variables.

In the first regression, for watching the NFL for excitement the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 52.45$ ,  $R^2 = .44$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .57$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported higher levels of watching for excitement ( $r = .64$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of watching for excitement ( $B = .10$ ,  $p < .08$ ;  $M_{men} = 3.93$ ,  $sd = .79$ ;  $M_{women} = 3.39$ ,  $sd = .80$ ). Results also indicated that, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of levels of watching for excitement ( $B = .12$ ,  $p < .04$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average need to watch for excitement of 4.24 ( $sd = .50$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average need to watch for excitement of 3.57 ( $sd = .86$ ). These overall results are reported in column 1 of Table 21.

In the second regression, for watching the NFL for information the overall results were not significant ( $F_{3, 198} = 2.61$ ,  $R^2 = .04$ ,  $p < .06$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .20$ ,  $p < .02$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported higher levels of watching for information ( $r = .20$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of watching for information ( $B = .01$ ,  $p < .87$ ;  $M_{men} = 2.26$ ,  $sd = .84$ ;  $M_{women} = 2.14$ ,  $sd = .84$ ). Results also indicated that fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of levels of watching for information ( $B = -.01$ ,  $p < .88$ ;  $M_f = 2.30$ ,  $sd = .74$ ;  $M_{nf} = 2.19$ ,  $sd = .87$ ). These overall results are reported in column 2 of table 21.

Table 21: Regression Coefficients for Instrumental Viewing Patterns

|                       | Excitement | Information |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------|
| Fandom Identification | .571***    | .195*       |
| Gender                | .102       | .013        |
| Fantasy Participation | .124*      | -.012       |
| R-square              | .442       | .038        |
| F-Value               | 52.446***  | 2.614       |

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Overall, when simultaneously accounting for the effects of sport fandom identification and gender, this study found fantasy participation to be a significant predictor of watching the NFL for excitement. However, fantasy participation was not a significant predictor of watching the NFL for information.

*RQ 5: Fantasy football participation and ritualistic viewing*

Research question five involved ritualistic viewing. To determine whether NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report less ritualistic viewing patterns in media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues a series of regression were performed. Using the results from the factor analysis performed earlier, viewing the NFL to pass time, for companionship, and for escape were used as dependent variables. In each of these regressions sports fandom identification, gender and fantasy football participation were entered as independent variables.

In the first regression, for watching the NFL to pass time the overall results were not significant ( $F_{3,199} = 1.77$ ,  $R^2 = .03$ ,  $p < .16$ ). Fandom identification was not a significant predictor ( $B = .05$ ,  $p < .55$ ). Also, gender was not a significant predictor of

watching to pass time ( $B = .08, p < .28$ ;  $M_{men} = 2.93, sd = .88$ ;  $M_{women} = 2.87, sd = .78$ ). In contrast to these two variables, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of levels of watching to pass time ( $B = -.17, p < .03$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average need to watch to pass time of 2.72 ( $sd = .84$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average need to watch to pass time of 2.97 ( $sd = .84$ ). These overall results are reported in column 1 of Table 22. These results are not surprising considering that watching to pass time is an activity which takes very little emotional and physical commitment of the viewer. Fans who do not participate in fantasy football could have a lower commitment to the game and thus watch just to pass time.

In the second regression, for watching the NFL for companionship the overall results were not significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 2.15, R^2 = .03, p < .10$ ). Fandom identification was not a significant predictor ( $B = -.06, p < .46$ ). However, gender was a significant predictor of watching for companionship ( $B = .19, p < .02$ ). Men reported more need to watch for companionship ( $M = 1.83, sd = .84$ ) than women ( $M = 1.60, sd = .67$ ). The results also indicated that fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of levels of watching for companionship ( $B = -.09, p < .27$ ;  $M_f = 1.69, sd = .75$ ;  $M_{nf} = 1.76, sd = .80$ ). These overall results are reported in column 2 of Table 22.

In the third regression, for watching the NFL for escape the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 198} = 5.48, R^2 = .08, p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .20, p < .01$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported higher levels of watching for escape ( $r = .25$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of watching for escape ( $B = .11, p < .15$ ;  $M_{men} = 3.20, sd = .92$ ;

Mwomen = 2.84, sd = .97). Similar to gender, fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of levels of watching for escape ( $B = .04$ ,  $p < .58$ ;  $M_f = 3.31$ ,  $sd = .98$ ;  $M_{nf} = 2.99$ ,  $sd = .93$ ). These overall results are reported in column 3 of Table 22.

Table 22: Regression Coefficients for Ritualistic Viewing Patterns

|                       | Pass Time | Companionship | Escape   |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|----------|
| Fandom Identification | .046      | -.056         | .203**   |
| Gender                | .082      | .186*         | .108     |
| Fantasy Participation | -.171*    | -.086         | .042     |
| R-square              | .026      | .031          | .077     |
| F-Value               | 1.765     | 2.146         | 5.484*** |

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

Overall, when simultaneously accounting for the effects of for sport fandom identification and gender, this study found fantasy participation to be a significant predictor of watching the NFL to pass time, although, the overall regression results were not significant for the pass time variable. Also, fantasy participation was not a significant predictor of watching the NFL for companionship and escape.

*RQ6: Fantasy football participation and gratifications*

Research question six involved gratifications received from the media. To determine what differences exist in gratifications received from the media by NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues compared to those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues a series of regression were performed. Using the sports fan motivation scale and the motivation scale for sports consumption discussed earlier, the needs for eustress, self-esteem, knowledge, group affiliation, risk-taking, escape, and aesthetics were used as dependent

variables. In each of these regressions sports fandom identification, gender and fantasy football participation were entered as independent variables.

In the first regression, for the need for eustress (positive stress) the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 198} = 17.72$ ,  $R^2 = .21$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .36$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported a higher need for eustress ( $r = .43$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of the need for eustress ( $B = .06$ ,  $p < .36$ ;  $M_{men} = 3.23$ ,  $sd = 1.00$ ;  $M_{women} = 2.77$ ,  $sd = .97$ ). Results also indicated that fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of the need for eustress ( $B = .15$ ,  $p < .03$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average need for eustress of 3.58 ( $sd = .83$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average need for eustress of 2.90 ( $sd = 1.01$ ). These overall results are reported in column 1 of Table 23.

In the second regression, for the need for self-esteem the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 17.24$ ,  $R^2 = .21$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .37$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported a higher need for self-esteem ( $r = .43$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of the need for self-esteem ( $B = .03$ ,  $p < .70$ ;  $M_{men} = 3.01$ ,  $sd = .91$ ;  $M_{women} = 2.77$ ,  $sd = .97$ ). Results also indicated that fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of the need for self-esteem ( $B = .15$ ,  $p < .04$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average need for self-esteem of 3.31 ( $sd = .77$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average need for self-esteem of 2.75 ( $sd = .86$ ). These overall results are reported in column 2 of Table 23.

In the third regression, for the need for knowledge the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 63.01$ ,  $R^2 = .49$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .44$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported a higher need for knowledge ( $r = .59$ ). Also, gender was a significant predictor of the need for knowledge ( $B = .21$ ,  $p < .001$ ) with men reporting more need for knowledge ( $M = 3.37$ ,  $sd = 1.23$ ) than women ( $M = 2.22$ ,  $sd = .95$ ). In addition to these two variables, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of the need for knowledge ( $B = .28$ ,  $p < .001$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average need for knowledge of 4.04 ( $sd = .92$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average need for knowledge of 2.60 ( $sd = 1.16$ ). These overall results are reported in column 3 of Table 23.

In the fourth regression, for the need for group affiliation the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 12.87$ ,  $R^2 = .16$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was also a significant predictor ( $B = .32$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported a higher need for group affiliation ( $r = .35$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of the need for group affiliation ( $B = -.13$ ,  $p < .08$ ;  $M_{men} = 3.74$ ,  $sd = .88$ ;  $M_{women} = 3.67$ ,  $sd = .93$ ). Results also indicated that fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of the need for group affiliation ( $B = .21$ ,  $p < .01$ ). A comparison of the means indicate that fantasy football players reported an average need for group affiliation of 4.13 ( $sd = .65$ ), while nonparticipants reported an average need for group affiliation of 3.58 ( $sd = .92$ ). These overall results are reported in column 4 of Table 23.



In the fifth regression, for the need for risk-taking the overall results were not significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 2.47$ ,  $R^2 = .04$ ,  $p < .07$ ). Fandom identification was not a significant predictor ( $B = -.03$ ,  $p < .73$ ). However, gender was a significant predictor of the need for risk-taking ( $B = .21$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Men reported more need for risk-taking ( $M = 2.04$ ,  $sd = 1.08$ ) than women ( $M = 1.68$ ,  $sd = .78$ ). Results also indicated that fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of the need for risk-taking ( $B = -.06$ ,  $p < .45$ ;  $mf = 1.91$ ,  $sd = 1.11$ ;  $Mnf = 1.91$ ,  $sd = .96$ ). These overall results are reported in column 5 of Table 23.

In the sixth regression, for the need for escape the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 5.80$ ,  $R^2 = .08$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .16$ ,  $p < .03$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported a higher need for escape ( $r = .23$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of the need for escape ( $B = .09$ ,  $p < .23$ ;  $Mmen = 2.94$ ,  $sd = .95$ ;  $Mwomen = 2.58$ ,  $sd = .99$ ). Like gender, fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of the need for escape ( $B = .13$ ,  $p < .09$ ;  $Mf = 3.17$ ,  $sd = .77$ ;  $Mnf = 2.70$ ,  $sd = 1.01$ ). These overall results are reported in column 6 of Table 23.

In the seventh regression, for the need for aesthetics the overall results were significant ( $F_{3, 199} = 16.54$ ,  $R^2 = .20$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Fandom identification was a significant predictor ( $B = .38$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that those with higher fandom identification reported a higher need for aesthetics ( $r = .43$ ). However, gender was not a significant predictor of the need for aesthetics ( $B = .07$ ,  $p < .33$ ;  $Mmen = 3.27$ ,  $sd = 1.12$ ;  $Mwomen = 2.78$ ,  $sd = 1.00$ ). Results also indicated that fantasy football participation was not a

significant predictor of the need for aesthetics ( $B = .10$ ,  $p < .16$ ;  $M_f = 3.57$ ,  $sd = .84$ ;  $M_{nf} = 2.94$ ,  $sd = 1.14$ ). These overall results are reported in column 7 of Table 23.

Table 23: Regression Coefficients for gratifications received

|                       | Eustress  | Self-Esteem | Knowledge | Group Affiliation | Risk-Taking | Escape   | Aesthetics |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|----------|------------|
| Fandom Identification | .359***   | .371***     | .436***   | .320***           | -.027       | .162*    | .375***    |
| Gender                | .063      | .027        | .214***   | -.125             | .205**      | .088     | .068       |
| Fantasy Participation | .152*     | .151*       | .278***   | .206**            | -.058       | .130     | .100       |
| R-square              | .212      | .206        | .487      | .162              | .036        | .080     | .200       |
| F-Value               | 17.719*** | 17.236***   | 63.010*** | 12.869***         | 2.467       | 5.804*** | 16.538***  |

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

Overall, when accounting for the simultaneous effects of sport fandom identification and gender, this study found fantasy participation to be a significant predictor of the need for eustress, self-esteem, knowledge and group affiliation. However, fantasy participation was not a significant predictor of the need for risk-taking, escape and aesthetics.

An interesting finding on needs was the order that they came in from highest mean to lowest for each group. Fantasy football participants reported these needs in order of highest to lowest: Group affiliation ( $M = 4.13$ ), knowledge ( $M = 4.04$ ), eustress ( $M = 3.58$ ), aesthetics ( $M = 3.57$ ), self-esteem ( $M = 3.31$ ), escape ( $M = 3.17$ ) and risk-taking ( $M = 1.91$ ). Fantasy football participants seemed to show a higher need for group affiliation, knowledge, eustress, and aesthetics while a lower need for self-esteem, escape and risk-taking. Participants who did not play fantasy football reported these needs in order from highest to lowest: Group affiliation ( $M = 3.58$ ), aesthetics ( $M = 2.94$ ), eustress ( $M = 2.90$ ), self-esteem ( $M = 2.75$ ), escape ( $M = 2.70$ ), knowledge ( $M = 2.60$ ) and risk-taking ( $M = 1.91$ ). The main difference in the order of nonparticipants compared to those

who play fantasy sports seems to be the need for knowledge with fantasy players reporting a much higher need for knowledge. This is not surprising considering fantasy football requires the individual to be a more knowledgeable fan and investigate statistics and trends fairly closely in order to succeed at the fantasy game.

In order to test for differences in these need gratification variables, oneway analyses of variance were used. For need gratification, significant differences based on fantasy participation were found for the need for eustress ( $F(1, 200) = 18.70$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .09$ ,  $p < .01$ ), self esteem ( $F(1, 201) = 17.22$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .08$ ,  $p < .01$ ), escape ( $F(1, 201) = 9.44$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .05$ ,  $p < .01$ ), knowledge ( $F(1, 201) = 64.04$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .24$ ,  $p < .01$ ), aesthetics ( $F(1, 201) = 12.89$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .06$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and group belonging ( $F(1, 201) = 15.64$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .07$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Overall this indicates that fantasy participants are higher in the need for positive stress (Mf = 3.58, sd = .83; Mn = 2.90, sd = 1.01), self esteem (Mf = 3.31, sd = .77; Mn = 2.75, sd = .86), escape (Mf = 3.17, sd = .77; Mn = 2.70, sd = 1.01), knowledge (Mf = 4.04, sd = .92; Mn = 2.60, sd = 1.16), beauty and grace (Mf = 3.57, sd = .84; Mn = 2.94, sd = 1.14) and group belonging (Mf = 4.13, sd = .65; Mn = 3.58, sd = .92). However, no significant difference was found between fantasy participants and nonparticipants on the need for risk taking ( $F(1, 201) = .00$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .00$ ,  $p < .99$ , power = .05).

### Summary

This chapter reported the results of this study. After the demographic check was performed, gender was also included as an independent variable due to the significant differences between men and women on the dependent variables. When accounting for the simultaneous effects of gender and sport fan identification, fantasy football

participation had a significant effect on the amount of electronic media use for NFL information or entertainment, involvement, and the gratification variables of eustress, self-esteem, knowledge and group affiliation. No significant effect was found on the amount of use of print media for NFL information or entertainment, pre-exposure selectivity, instrumental/ritualistic viewing patterns, and the gratification variables of risk-taking, escape and aesthetics. The following chapter will discuss the implication of these findings.

## Chapter 5

### Discussion

This section will include a brief review of the rationale, methods and results of the study, discuss implications of the results, address limitations of the study, and consider future research that can be done based on this study.

Media research has largely ignored the growing popularity of fantasy sports play. While nonscientific studies indicate that fantasy sports have created a greater amount of media consumption (Cox, 2002; Walker, 2005) and a greater amount of pre and post-game thought (Beason, 2004), academic research on fantasy sports has been limited to gambling issues, the analysis of online conversations, and the use of the game to enhance marketing concepts (Bernhard, 2005; Hiltner, 1996; Gillentine, 2001).

The absence of media research on fantasy sports play is surprising considering that media outlets have changed and even created new ways to reach fans. Fox Sports Network, CBS, and ESPN have all aired a half-hour show providing fantasy football advice on which players were going to perform well in an upcoming week (Shipman, 2001). In addition, CBS has begun giving viewers instant statistics about a player immediately following a play. Halftime shows now include a fantasy notebook section which gives up to the minute statistics of high profile players. Direct TV offers subscribers a pay service called the "Red Zone" in which they will display an NFL football game every time a team is inside the twenty yard line. This allows viewers to see first hand any professional player who is about to score a touchdown.

Previous research has found that the uses and gratifications perspective of media effects sees a medium or message as one source of influence within the context of other

possible influences (Rubin, 2002). In simpler terms, in order to explain media effects, we must first understand the characteristics, motivation, selectivity and involvement of the audience members (Rosengren, 1974). Past uses and gratifications studies have centered around the motives individuals have for using specific types of media (Kaye, 1998; Leung & Wei, 2000; Robinson, Barth and Kohut, 1997), identifying links among media-use motives and exposure and their associations with media attitudes and behaviors (Levy & Windahl, 1985; Lin, 1993) and the social and psychological circumstances of media use (Cohen, 1981; Walker, 1990; Windahl, Hojerback & Hedinson, 1986). While fantasy sport participation could be studied with the previous perspectives in mind, no uses and gratification studies exist pertaining to fantasy sports participation.

Denham (2004) offers some credibility to studying fantasy sports participation based on the uses and gratifications approach by suggesting that if we assume that multiple social and psychological factors influence media enjoyment, then social norms and viewing situations are equally as important as content in perceived media enjoyment. In other words, the viewing context is equally as important as the content presented. By taking the uses and gratifications perspective and applying it to fantasy football participation, this study attempted to isolate a viewing situation which could be partially responsible for creating a more active and purposeful viewer who is more involved in the viewing process.

This study focused on the influence fantasy football participation had on media use, pre-exposure selectivity, involvement, viewing motives and need gratifications received when accounting for the effects of sports fandom identification. The participants, students enrolled in a basic speech communication class and recruited

members of fantasy football leagues were asked to complete a survey that looked at how their participation or nonparticipation in fantasy football affected their uses and gratifications of media content pertaining to the National Football League.

Based on a series of oneway analyses of variance on the categorical demographic variables, gender was included into the subsequent regression analyses due to significant difference between men and women on most of the dependent variables. Not enough differences were found based on race, education level and family income to warrant inclusion in the regression analyses.

Based on a series of regressions on the continuous variables of sport fandom identification and age on the dependent variables, sport fandom identification was also included into the overall regression analyses since it was a significant predictor of most of the dependent variables. Not enough significant relationships existed with the dependent variables to justify the inclusion of age into the overall regression analyses. The inclusion of sport fandom identification was expected based on previous research.

The following section will include an interpretation of the results discussed in chapter 4 and discuss the relevant findings in relation to uses and gratifications theory. The section will close with a discussion of the study's strengths, limitations, and future research suggestions.

The first research question asked if NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues consume more sports media than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues. The overall results from a series of regression analyses indicated that when simultaneously accounting for the effects of sport fandom identification and gender, fantasy participation was still a

significant predictor of hours per week spent on the internet, watching television, and listening to the radio for NFL information or entertainment. Fantasy participation was not a significant predictor of hours spent reading a newspaper, reading a magazine, and using wireless services for NFL information or entertainment. Although for each specific media use fantasy football participants used more media than fans who did not participate, the significant differences seemed to come from the electronic media more than the print media.

The second research question asked if NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater pre-exposure selectivity of media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues. The overall results from a series of regression analyses indicated that when simultaneously accounting for the effects of sport fandom identification and gender, fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of pre-exposure selectivity. In other words, fantasy football participation was not a significant predictor of the advanced knowledge an individual has to select a certain game to watch. This includes knowing what media outlet to use, knowing how many games are available, and knowing when the games are available.

The third research question asked if NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater cognitive, behavioral, and affective involvement in media content pertaining to the NFL than fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues. The overall results from the series of regression analyses indicated that when simultaneously accounting for sport fandom identification and gender, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of



cognitive, behavioral and affective media involvement. In all cases, fantasy participation resulted in higher involvement levels than fans not participating in fantasy football.

The fourth and fifth research questions asked if NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues report greater instrumental and less ritualistic viewing patterns in media content pertaining to the NFL than those fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues. The overall results of a series of regression analyses indicated that when simultaneously accounting for the effects of sport fandom identification and gender, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of viewing for excitement and viewing to pass time. However, fantasy participation was not a significant predictor of watching for information, social reasons, watching for companionship and escape. These results are a bit surprising considering past research has indicated that higher involved individuals will engage in more instrumental viewing patterns and less ritualistic viewing patterns. This may be due to the fact that the scale was originally designed to test daytime soap opera viewing and may not have transferred over well to the National Football League. Additionally, the scale was designed specifically for television viewing and asked questions such as “I watch the NFL to learn things I haven’t done before.” The questions asked in this section need further investigation to adapt better to NFL viewing.

Finally, the sixth research question asked what differences exist in gratifications received from the media by NFL fans with similar sport fandom identification who participate in fantasy football leagues compared to NFL fans who do not participate in fantasy football leagues. The overall results from a series of regressions indicated that when simultaneously accounting for the effects of sport fandom identification and

gender, fantasy participation was a significant predictor of gratifications received from eustress, self-esteem, knowledge and group affiliation. Fantasy participation was not a significant predictor of gratifications received from risk-taking, escape and aesthetics.

### Theoretical Implications

This study has provided support to the idea that the viewing context should be considered an important factor when taking a uses and gratifications approach to research. The results show that one such contextual factor, fantasy football participation was a significant predictor of certain media use variables for NFL information and entertainment (television, radio and internet), involvement, and certain gratifications received (eustress, self-esteem, knowledge and group affiliation). Furthermore, although not related specifically to the research questions, another contextual factor, sport fandom identification was also found to be a significant predictor of most variables related to media use for NFL information and entertainment, pre-exposure selectivity, involvement, and gratifications received. Sports fandom identification did not predict radio use for NFL information and entertainment or gratifications received from risk-taking. This study suggests that factors which are part of the viewing context, in this case fantasy football participation and sports fandom identification have an effect on the amount of media use and gratifications received from it. The uses and gratifications perspective is based on the idea that in order to understand how the media affects people, we must first understand how people use the media. This study provides evidence that the viewing context is important in understanding how people use the media. Given different contexts, people use the media differently. Previous research has also identified audience activity as important in determining how and why the media is used. The benefits to the

present study is that an attempt was made to isolate a specific viewing context, which may lead to greater audience activity and look at the relationship the specific context had on media uses and gratifications received.

Previous popular research has indicated that fantasy football participants watch more televised games, log on to the internet more, and think about the games more during the week (Beason, 2004; Cox, 2002 & Walker, 2005). In terms of media use, this research found similar results. However, more specifically fantasy football play seemed to have a more significant impact on the use of electronic media rather than the print media for NFL information and entertainment. Fantasy participants appear to be watching more television, listening to more radio, and logging onto the internet more for NFL information and entertainment, but the readership in newspaper and magazines appear to remain unchanged when compared to fans not participating in fantasy sports. Sport fandom identification was also found to be a significant predictor of all media use variables except radio use for NFL information and entertainment. These results suggest that the addition of a contextual factor, in this case fantasy football participation can have an effect on the amount of some media use. Since uses and gratifications theory is an audience centered approach and audience activity has been found to be an important factor in the amount of media an individual uses, this study suggests that contextual factors are important in determining the amount of use the media will receive. It also suggests factors such as fantasy football play do not affect the use of every form of media. The results suggest that different types of media can be affected by these factors. From a uses and gratifications viewpoint then, researchers cannot assume that the

introduction of a contextual factor like fantasy football will have the same effect on all types of media use.

As stated earlier, a key concept to the uses and gratifications theory is audience activity. Individuals identified as active audience members have been found to use greater amounts of media and be more purposeful in their media use. Variables that are generally considered in determining audience activity are pre-exposure selectivity and involvement. Krugman's (1966) definition of involvement is direct personal experience during message reception which causes a viewer to pay more attention to the content, identify with the characters, and react more emotionally to what is viewed. The results of this study indicate that fantasy football participants were significantly higher in cognitive, behavioral, and affective involvement levels. Also, sport fandom identification was found to be a significant predictor of not only involvement, but also of pre-exposure selectivity. The value of this study is that two viewing contexts, in this case fantasy football participation and sport fandom identification, were found to be important in factors related to audience activity. When applying this to uses and gratifications, fantasy football participation appears to have an affect on the amount a viewer pays attention to content, identifies with characters, and reacts more emotionally to media content. Other viewing context factors such as online voting for a reality show could evoke greater involvement because the viewer has made a choice and wants to see if the choice he or she makes becomes a reality.

Previous sports psychological research (Milne & McDonald, 1999; Trail, Anderson & Fink, 2000; Wann, 1995) has identified several motivational needs sports fans possess. This study has found that fantasy football participation appears to affect

certain need gratifications received. The study found eustress, self-esteem, knowledge and group affiliation needs to be significantly greater among fantasy participants. Fantasy participation didn't have a significant impact on watching for aesthetic reasons and escape. In addition, sports fandom identification was a significant predictor of all of the need variables with the exception of risk-taking. This suggests that context variables, such as fantasy football and sports fandom identification, may affect gratifications received from the media. From a uses and gratifications perspective, the more context variables that can be found in a given situation, the more that can be learned about the audience gratifications received. Participating in Fantasy football appears to make a difference in media gratifications received, but different kinds of games such as on-line voting of reality programs, the physical viewing environment, the mood of the viewer, or life situations such as a divorce or the loss of a job could also have an affect on gratifications received.

The one need that was not significant and a bit surprising was risk-taking. Some leagues play for prizes or a sum of money which increases the amount of risk a person could invest. In this study, fantasy football participation did not affect the need for risk-taking. In fact, when comparing the means of all needs received, risk-taking was at the bottom of both fantasy participants and of fans who do not participate in fantasy football. This suggests that using the media to gratify risk-taking needs is not that important to these sports fans. One explanation for why it is such a low priority could be that the questions for this study that involved risk-taking had to do with gambling and betting issues. In most areas of the United States, including the area where this sample was taken from, gambling and betting on sports is an illegal activity. Also, many people have been

taught since they were young that gambling is an immoral act. The fact that gambling is illegal and considered to many as being immoral could explain why risk-taking needs were rated so low. In this study, even though some risk may be involved in fantasy football participation, it didn't have an effect on the need for risk-taking.

Finally, the results suggest that if viewing situations have an effect, then the amount of media an individual uses and the gratifications received from media use is constantly changing. This study found a relationship with fantasy football and sport fandom identification on specific media uses and gratifications, but based on these results, it would appear that as other contextual factors are introduced into the viewing environment they too will have some effect on media usage. Factors such as the introduction of other games, especially those like fantasy football where what the viewer sees on the media affects the outcome of a separate game being played should have an effect on media use and gratification. For instance, fantasy games in other sports, picking the winner of college or professional games, or even the winner of a reality contest, puts the viewer in a situation in which what they view on the media has impact on a separate game being played. This viewing context may also affect the amount of use an individual has for the media and the gratifications received from it.

#### Limitations

This exploratory study also has a few limitations for the media scholar and media producer to understand. The following section will review some of the limitations and restrictions that were encountered during this research project.

The first limitation is the subjects used in this study. Like many research projects using college students, the interpretation of results cannot be generalized to the entire

population of sports fans. College students may differ in their amount of media usage and needs they possess because of such things as lifestyle differences and their understanding of the newer media technology. Further research should look at a more diverse group of subjects. However, because this study found little to no significant differences with regards to age, race, education and income levels, the use of college students may not be a problem in looking at the results of this study.

A second limitation is the number of individuals who participate in fantasy football used in this study. Although an attempt was made to increase the number of individuals who participate in fantasy football by recruiting individuals from outside of the basic communication class, this number was still fairly small compared to that of people who do not participate. This imbalance may explain the low power observed in this study. However, the fact that many significant results were found even given the small power numbers may suggest that a stronger relationship exists between fantasy participation and sport fandom identification on the dependent variables. This could provide even more evidence that the viewing context is important to consider when looking at media uses and gratifications.

Finally, this study did not make an attempt to look at the causal relationship between fantasy participation and involvement. While this study identified that fantasy participation is a significant predictor of involvement and fantasy participants report higher involvement levels, what is not known is the causal direction of the relationship. For example, does fantasy participation have an effect on involvement which in turn has an effect on use and gratifications, or is it involvement that actually increases the likelihood of fantasy participation which has the effect on use and gratifications?

However, since participation in a fantasy league requires an individual to acquire knowledge and seek out information to be successful, it is more likely to assume that fantasy participation is increasing the involvement levels of NFL fans.

#### Future Research and Implications

Future research using the uses and gratifications perspective should continue to look at different social and situational factors that could affect how and why individuals use the media. Fantasy football participation and sport fandom identification are just a couple of factors that affect media use. For instance, some reality programs are offering viewers a chance to vote by phone or on the internet for their favorite performer or entertainer. It would be interesting to see if this activity has an effect on media use and gratification for that type of programming. The participation in internet chat rooms discussing programs could have an effect. If individuals are actively talking about program content online, involvement may increase which would lead to greater use and different types of gratifications received from the media. CNN and ESPN are becoming more interactive allowing viewers to choose stories they want to see both on-line and through satellite television. This could have an effect on the gratifications received by viewers because unlike the traditional idea of the viewer receiving the information sent by the mass media, the viewer has more control over the content. It could also affect media use. If an individual can actually choose what stories to watch (or not watch), media use may be affected either positively or negatively. Researchers should continue to find viewing contexts that could affect the uses and gratification of the media and continue to explore them.



In addition, fantasy football participation is just one of many games that media users play which could affect viewing. Besides other fantasy sports such as fantasy baseball, basketball, golf, Nascar, etc., there are pick contests where through the internet or through satellite television, viewers can attempt to predict the outcome of certain college or professional sporting events. These games may have an effect on media use and gratifications because the outcome of the game being played rests on the outcome of the media content. By including a separate game within the media content, it could create a more involved viewer who pays more attention to the content, identifies with the characters, and reacts more emotionally to what is viewed. Even other media content besides sports could be researched. For example, reality programs are allowing viewers to vote on such things as who should leave the show or who should win a reality contest. These voting activities which usually occur either by telephone, text messaging, or internet voting could also be seen as an activity which could increase involvement.

Another research direction could be in media effects. The uses and gratifications perspective is grounded in the idea that in order to determine the effect media has on people, we must first look at how people use the media. This study has found that fantasy football participation may have an effect on how people use the media and what they want from the media. The next step may be to look at how the media affects the individuals. For example, media outlets are beginning to give fans more statistical information. In NFL broadcasts for instance the number of catches, yards gained and touchdowns are displayed for a receiver after he gets the ball. Research should be conducted to see what effects this additional information has on the viewer. Is this individual information creating a fan who prefers to focus on individual accomplishments

and achievements rather than team accomplishments? On a larger scale, is the addition of such information into the broadcast creating a more individualistic society? Research could look into if playing fantasy games where individual accomplishments are rewarded carries into the workforce for instance.

A final research direction could be the idea of self-esteem. Since this study found that fantasy football participants have a greater need to watch the NFL for self-esteem needs, it would be interesting to research this further. Research on self-esteem and sports has found that fans tend to bask in the reflected glory (BIRG) and cut off reflected failure (CORF) when watching team sports (Hirt, Zillmann, Erickson & Kennedy, 1992). As stated earlier, fans BIRG by publicizing their connection with a successful team. This can include wearing team apparel after a win, displaying flags or other paraphernalia of the team or using the term “we” to describe a victory. CORFing refers to how individuals protect their image after a loss. This can include not wearing team apparel or displaying team paraphernalia after losses or using the term “they” to describe a loss. More importantly, BIRGing and CORFing have been found to be linked to not only self-esteem, but also the prediction of a persons own performance at several unrelated tasks. Research could be done on fantasy football participation and self-esteem to determine if playing the game has an effect on the prediction of outcome performances on other tasks such as taking a test or completing an assignment.

The findings in this study looked at a social situation which could influence an individual’s uses and gratifications of the media. This study has found some support for the fact that fantasy football participation has an effect on how individuals view the media and what they get from it. Looking at how individuals use certain media and what

they want from media without taking into account social situations which surround the use does not tell researchers the whole story. It is my hope that as mass media research continues we can continue to find new variables to add to our understanding of how and why people use the media. The introduction of new variables will only aid in our understanding of media effect and how media producers should construct their information to an ever changing audience.

## Appendix A

### Script

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_. Today I will be distributing a survey about media uses pertaining to the national football league. The survey is part of a doctoral studies project thru the University of Missouri. The survey should take about 15 minutes and the purpose of the study is to look at the amount of media use and needs that individuals have for media related to the National Football League. Your participation although greatly appreciated is strictly voluntary. You will receive no grade or extra credit for your participation and you may stop at any time. Your participation does require that you be at least 18 years of age and have viewed or listened to at least three National Football League games in the past year. This study will involve no risk to you and your identity will not be revealed. Results will be reported using demographic data. If you have any questions feel free to contact the researcher or the research office. Their contact information is on the consent form I am about to pass out.

Do you have any questions regarding this survey?

Great, I am now passing around the consent form and survey. Please remember you must be at least 18 years of age and have viewed or listened to at least three National Football League games in the past year. If you have any questions, feel free to ask.

Appendix B

- Title: Media uses and gratifications of the National Football League.
- Researcher: Troy O. Comeau, a Doctoral candidate in the Department of Communication, University of Missouri – Columbia.
- Advisor: Michael Kramer, PhD., Professor and Department Chair, Department of Communication, University of Missouri – Columbia.
- Purpose: This project will study the amount of media use and the needs individuals have for consuming media related to the National Football League.
- Participation: Participation in this survey requires that you be at least 18 years old. Your participation is voluntary. You may quit the survey at any time.
- Risk: No risk is involved in the study. The survey will use demographic data and your identity will not be revealed.
- Confidentiality: Your identity will not be revealed in any written documents or presentations.
- Contact: Troy O. Comeau  
Department of Communication  
Pittsburg State University  
121 Whitesitt Hall  
Pittsburg, KS 66762  
(620) 235-4721  
E-mail: [tcomeau@pittstate.edu](mailto:tcomeau@pittstate.edu)
- Questions: If you have any questions about your rights, contact:  
Campus IRB – Office of Research  
483 McReynolds Hall  
Columbia, MO 65211  
(573) 882-9585

Thank you for your participation,

Troy O. Comeau

By returning this signed survey, you are stating that you understand your rights.

---

Signature

Date

Appendix C

Before you begin, let me assure you that all of the information you give me is confidential, and none of it will be released in any way that would permit the identification of you or your family. The results will aid in the understanding of how individuals receive and use information about the National Football League. Of course, your participation is voluntary and should only take about ten minutes of your time.

**If you are not 18 years of age or older, please do not fill out this survey.**

Have you listened to, or viewed at least three National Football League games either live or on a media outlet in the past year?

Yes

No

**If you answered no to the previous question, please do not continue this survey.**

Section 1

The survey begins by asking you some questions about being a sport fan in general. For each of the statements, select the response that most accurately describes your opinion.

- 1 means strongly disagree
- 2 means disagree
- 3 means neutral
- 4 means agree
- 5 means strongly agree

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I consider myself to be a sport fan.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. My friends see me as a sport fan.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I believe that following sports is the most enjoyable form of entertainment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. My life would be less enjoyable if I were not allowed to follow sports.      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Being a sport fan is very important to me.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Section 2

Please estimate the time you spend with the media in an average week during the National Football League's **regular season**.

1. On an average week during the NFL season how many hours do you spend reading a daily newspaper for information or entertainment on the NFL? \_\_\_\_\_
2. On an average week during the NFL season how many hours do you spend reading a magazine for information or entertainment on the NFL? \_\_\_\_\_
3. On an average week during the NFL season how many hours do you spend using a wireless service such as a web phone for information or entertainment on the NFL? \_\_\_\_\_
4. On an average week during the NFL season how many hours do you spend on internet web sites for information or entertainment on the NFL? \_\_\_\_\_
5. On an average week during the NFL season how many hours do you spend watching television for information or entertainment on the NFL, please include time spent viewing NFL games? \_\_\_\_\_
6. On an average week during the NFL season how many hours do you spend listening to the radio for information or entertainment on the NFL, please include time spent listening to NFL games? \_\_\_\_\_

Section 3

For each of the statements, select the response that most accurately describes your opinion on a scale from one to five where one means never and five means very often.

1. How often do you know in advance the media outlet you will use to gain information or entertainment about the National Football League?  

Never   1   2   3   4   5   Very Often
2. How often do you feel you know how many NFL games are available for you to watch or listen to on the media in a given week?  

Never   1   2   3   4   5   Very Often

3. How often do you feel you know when to find information or entertainment on the National Football League?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 Very Often

Section 4

For each of the statements select the response that most accurately describes your opinion.

1 means strongly disagree  
 2 means disagree  
 3 is neutral  
 4 means agree  
 5 means strongly agree

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. NFL players are almost like friends you see everyday.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. After viewing a game, I think about the game.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I see my favorite NFL player as a natural, down to earth person.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. After viewing a game, I try to predict what will happen next week.                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. My favorite NFL player seems to understand the kinds of things I want to know.                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. After viewing a game, I will talk about it with others.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I look forward to watching my favorite NFL player each week.                                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. After viewing a game, I will talk to others to try to predict what will happen in next weeks game. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I miss seeing my favorite NFL player when he is injured or the season is over.                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. I find my favorite NFL player to be attractive.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. After viewing a game, I will talk about individual players with others.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |



- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. After viewing a game, I think about individual plays.                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. If my favorite NFL player played for another team, I would follow that team.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. After viewing a game, I think about the players involved.                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I would like to meet my favorite NFL player in person.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I feel sorry for my favorite NFL players when they make a mistake.                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. If I saw a story about my favorite NFL player in a newspaper or magazine, I would read it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

### Section 5

For each of the statements select the response that most accurately describes why you watch the NFL.

1 means strongly disagree  
 2 means disagree  
 3 is neutral  
 4 means agree  
 5 means strongly agree

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I watch the NFL because it's enjoyable.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I watch the NFL for new information.                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I watch the NFL because it's something to do when friends come over. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I watch the NFL because it entertains me.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I watch the NFL because there is nothing better to do.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I watch the NFL to forget about work or things.                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I watch the NFL like a habit, something I do each week.              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I watch the NFL because it's exciting.                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I watch the NFL because it makes me feel less lonely.                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. I watch the NFL to learn things about myself and others.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. I watch the NFL because it's a pleasant rest.                                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I watch the NFL to talk with other people about what's on.                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. I watch the NFL because I just like to watch.                                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I watch the NFL because it's on.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I watch the NFL because it amuses me.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I watch the NFL because it relaxes me.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. I watch the NFL to be with other members of the family or friends who are watching. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. I watch the NFL because it's something to do to occupy my time.                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I watch the NFL because I have no one else to talk to or be with.                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. I watch the NFL because it's thrilling.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. I watch the NFL because it allows me to unwind.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. I watch the NFL to get away from others.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. I watch the NFL so I won't have to be alone.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. I watch the NFL to learn how to do things I haven't done before.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. I watch the NFL because it passes the time away, especially when I'm bored.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

## Section 6

For each of the statements select the response that most accurately describes your opinion.

1 means strongly disagree

2 means disagree

3 is neutral

4 means agree  
5 means strongly agree

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I get pumped up when I watch an NFL game.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. NFL games are enjoyable only if you can bet on the outcome.                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I regularly track the statistics of specific NFL players.                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I feel good when my NFL team wins.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. NFL games give me a chance to interact with others.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I read the box scores and team statistics regularly.                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. One of the main reasons I watch NFL games is so I can bet on sports.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I enjoy being physiologically aroused by NFL competition.                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Making wagers is the most enjoyable aspect of being an NFL fan.                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. NFL games represent an escape for me from my day-to-day activities.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. There is a certain natural beauty to the game.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I look forward to NFL games because they are something different to watch in the fall. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. I like the stimulation I get from watching NFL games.                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. NFL games create an opportunity to socialize with others.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. My favorite teams' successes are my successes and their losses are my losses.          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I appreciate the beauty inherent in the game.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Watching NFL games are a great change of pace<br>From what I regularly do.             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. I enjoy the gracefulness associated with the game.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I like watching NFL games with family and friends.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

20. Watching NFL games increases my self-esteem. 1 2 3 4 5
21. I usually know the team's win/loss record. 1 2 3 4 5

Section 7

Please answer the following questions.

1. What is your gender? Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. What is your race?
 

|                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| Asian           | _____ |
| American Indian | _____ |
| Black           | _____ |
| Hispanic        | _____ |
| White           | _____ |
| Other           | _____ |
  
3. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_
  
4. What is the highest level of education completed?
 

|                       |       |
|-----------------------|-------|
| No high school degree | _____ |
| High school graduate  | _____ |
| Some college          | _____ |
| College graduate      | _____ |
| Some post graduate    | _____ |
| Graduate degree       | _____ |
  
5. What is your family's annual income?
 

|                   |       |
|-------------------|-------|
| 0-\$10,000        | _____ |
| \$10,001-\$20,000 | _____ |
| \$20,001-\$30,000 | _____ |
| \$30,001-\$40,000 | _____ |
| \$40,001-\$50,000 | _____ |
| \$50,001-\$60,000 | _____ |
| \$60,001-\$70,000 | _____ |
| \$70,001+         | _____ |
  
6. Do you currently participate in a fantasy football league where NFL players are chosen or assigned to your fantasy team?
 

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

REFERENCES:

- Beason, K. (2004). [Generalized comprehensive fantasy sport consumer behavior results]. Unpublished raw data.
- Berelson, B. (1949). What "missing the newspaper" means. In P. F. Lazarsfeld & F. N. Stanton (Eds.), *Communications research 1948-1949* (pp. 111-129). New York: Harper.
- Berlyne, D.E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal and curiosity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bernhard, B. & Eade, V. (2005). Gambling in a fantasy world: An exploratory study of Rotisserie baseball games. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 9(1).
- Blumler, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies. *Communication Research*, 6, 9-36.
- Branscombe, B.R. & Wann, D.L. (1991). The positive social and self-concept consequences of sports team identification. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 15, 115-127.
- Brophy, J. (1987). Synthesis of research on strategies for motivating students to learn. *Educational leadership*, 40-48.
- Bryant, J., Rockwell, S., & Owns, J. (1994). "Buzzer beaters" and "barn burners": The effects on enjoyment of watching the game go "down to the wire". *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 18, 326-339.
- Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation and learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 323-340.
- Coffey, S. & Stipp, H. (1997). The interactions between computer and television usage. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 37(2), 61-67.

- Cohen, A. A. (1981). People without media: Attitudes and behavior during a general media strike. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 25, 171-180.
- Cox, J. (2002, September 19). Internet, media giants fuel growth of fantasy football into big industry. *News & Observer*.
- Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and Education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 26, 325-346.
- Denham, B. (2004). Toward an explication of media enjoyment: The synergy of social norms, viewing situations, and program content. *Communication Theory*, 14, 370-387.
- Dobos, J. (1992). Gratification models of satisfaction and choice of communication channels in organizations. *Communication Research*, 19, 29-51.
- Duda, J. L., & Nicholls, J. G. (1992). Dimensions of achievement motivation, schoolwork and sport. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 290-299.
- Elliott, P. (1974). Uses and gratifications research: A critique and a sociological alternative. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communications: current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 249-268). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ferguson, D. A. & Perse, E. M. (2000). The world wide web as a functional alternative to Television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44, 155-174.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975) *Belief, attitude, and behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Flanagin, A. J. & Metzger, M. J. (2001). Internet use in the contemporary media environment. *Human Communication Research, 27*, 153-181.
- Fulk, J. (1993). Social construction of communication technology. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 921-950.
- Fulk, J. & Boyd, B. (1991). Emerging theories of communication in organizations. *Journal of Management, 17*, 407-466.
- Gan, S. L, Tuggle, C. A., Mitrook, M. A., Coussement, S. H. & Zillmann, D. W. (1997). The thrill of a close game: Who enjoys it and who doesn't. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 21*, 53-64.
- Gantz, W. (1981). An exploration of viewing motives and behaviors associated with television sports. *Journal of Broadcasting, 25*, 263-275.
- Gantz, W. & Wenner, L. A. (1991). Men, women and sports: Audience experiences and effects. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 35*, 233-243.
- Gillentine, A. & Schulz, J. (2001). Marketing the fantasy football league: Utilization of simulation to enhance sport marketing concepts. *Journal of Marketing Education, 23*(3).
- Greenberg, B. & Woods, M. (1999). The soaps: Their sex, gratifications, and outcomes. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*, 250-257.
- Heeter, C. (1989). Implications of new interactive technologies for conceptualizing communication. In J.L. Salvaggio & J. Bryant (Eds.), *Media use in the information age: Emerging patterns of adoption and consumer use* (pp. 217-235). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Herzog, H. (1940). Professor quiz: A gratification study. In P. F. Lazarsfeld, *Radio and the printed page* (pp. 64-93). New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce.
- Hiltner, J. & Walker, J. (1996). Super frustration Sunday: The day prodigy's fantasy baseball died: An analysis of the dynamics of electronic communication. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 30(3).
- Hirt, E., Zillmann, D., Erickson, G. & Kennedy, C. (1992). Costs and benefits of allegiance: Changes in fans' self-ascribed competencies after team victory versus defeat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 724-738.
- Hoffner, C. (1996). Children's wishful identification and parasocial interaction with favorite television characters. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 40, 389-402.
- Horton, D. & Wohl, R. R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction. *Psychiatry*, 19, 215-229.
- Johnstone, J. W. (1974). Social integration and mass media use among adolescents: A case study. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communications: current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 35-48). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Katz, E. (1987). Communication research since Lazarsfeld. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51, 525-545.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of mass communication by the individual. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communications: current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 19-32). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.



- Katz, E. & Foulkes, D. (1962). On the use of mass media as escape: Clarification of a concept. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 26, 377-388.
- Katz, E., Gurevitch, M., & Haas, H. (1973). On the use of the mass media for important things. *American Sociological Review*, 38, 164-181.
- Kaye, B. (1998). Uses and gratifications of the world wide web: From couch potato to web potato. *The New Jersey Journal of Communication*, 6, 21-40.
- Krugman, H. E. (1966). The measurement of advertising involvement. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 30, 583-596.
- Leung, L. & Wei, R. (2000). More than just talk on the move: Uses and gratifications of the cellular phone. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77, 308-320.
- Levy, D. (2005). Sports fanship habits: An investigation of the active consumption of sport, its effects and social implications through the lives of fantasy sport enthusiasts. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut).
- Levy, M. (1978). Opinion leadership and television news uses. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42, 402-406.
- Levy, M. R. & Windahl, S. (1985). The concept of audience activity. In K. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), *Media gratifications research: Current perspectives* (pp. 109-122). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lin, C. A. (1993). Modeling the gratification-seeking process of television viewing. *Human Communication Research*, 20, 224-244.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper.

- McQuail, D., Blumler, J. G., & Brown, J. R. (1972). The television audience: A revised perspective. In D. McQuail (Ed.), *Sociology of mass communications* (pp. 135-165). Middlesex, England: Penguin.
- Mehus, I. (2005). Sociability and excitement motives of spectators attending entertainment sport events: Spectators of soccer and ski-jumping. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 28, 333-350.
- Mendelsohn, H. (1964). Listening to the radio. In L. A. Dexter & D. M. White (Eds.), *People, society and mass communication* (pp. 180-219). New York: Harper.
- Milne, G. R. & McDonald, M. A. (1999). *Sport marketing: Managing the exchange process*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Palmgreen, P. & Rayburn, J. D. (1979). Uses and gratifications and exposure to public television. *Communication Research*, 6, 155-180.
- Palmgreen, P. & Rayburn, J. D. (1985a). A comparison of gratification models of media satisfaction. *Communication Monographs*, 52, 334-346.
- Palmgreen, P. & Rayburn, J. D. (1985b). An expectancy-value approach to media gratifications. In K. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), *Media gratifications research: Current perspectives* (pp. 61-72). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Palmgreen, P., Wenner, L. A. & Rayburn, J. D. (1981). Gratification discrepancies and news program choice. *Communication Research*, 8, 451-478.

- Papa, M. J., Singhal, A., Law, S., Pant, S., Sood, S., Rogers, E. M., & Shefner-Rogers, C. L. (2000). Entertainment-education and social change: An analysis of parasocial interaction, social learning, collective efficacy, and paradoxical communication. *Journal of Communication, 50* (4), 31-55.
- Perse, E. M. (1986). Soap opera viewing patterns of college students and cultivation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 30*, 175-193.
- Perse, E. M. (1990). Audience selectivity and involvement in the newer media environment. *Communication Research, 17*, 675-697.
- Perse, E. M. & Ferguson, D. A. (1993). The impact of the newer television technologies on television satisfaction. *Journalism Quarterly, 70*, 843-853.
- Perse, E. M. & Dunn, D. G. (1998). The utility of home computers and media use: Implications of multimedia and connectivity. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 42*, 435-456.
- Pooley, J. (1978). The sport fan: A social psychology of misbehavior. *Sociology of Sport Monograph Series*. Calgary: CAPHER.
- Robinson, J., Barth, K. & Kohut, A. (1997). Social impact research: Personal computers, mass media, and use of time. *Social Science Computer Review, 15*, 65-82.
- Rosengren, K. E. (1974). Uses and gratifications: A paradigm outlined. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communications: current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 269-286). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rosengren, K. E., & Windahl, S. (1972). Mass media consumption as a functional alternative. In D. McQuail (Ed.), *Sociology of mass communications* (pp. 166-194). Middlesex, England: Penguin.

- Rubin, A. M. (1983). Television uses and gratifications: The interactions of viewing patterns and motivations. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 27, 37-51.
- Rubin, A. M. (2002). The uses-and-gratifications perspective of media effects. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.* (pp. 525-548). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Rubin, A., Haridakis, P. & Eyal, K. (2003). Viewer aggression and attraction to television Talk shows. *Media Psychology*, 5, 331-362.
- Rubin, A. M. & Kim, J. (1997). The variable influence of Audience Activity on Media Effects. *Communication Research*, 24(2), 107-135.
- Rubin, A. M. & Perse, E. M. (1987a). Audience activity and soap opera involvement: A uses and effects investigation. *Human Communication Research*, 14, 246-268.
- Rubin, A. M. & Perse, E. M. (1987b). Audience activity and television news gratifications. *Communication Research*, 14, 58-84.
- Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Powell, R. A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction, and local television news viewing. *Human Communication Research*, 12, 155-180.
- Rubin, A. M. & Rubin, R. B. (1985). Interface of personal and mediated communication: A research agenda. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2, 36-53.
- Ruggiero, T. E. (2000). Uses and gratifications theory in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3, 3-37.
- Sandomir, R. (2002, September 13). Reality of fantasy football: Root, root, root for no Team. *The New York Times*.

- Sapolsky, B. S. (1980). The effect of spectator disposition and suspense on the enjoyment of sport contests. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 11, 1-10.
- Sargent, S. L., Zillmann, D. W. & James, B. (1998). The gender gap in the enjoyment of televised sports. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 22, 46-64.
- Sherif, C. W., Sherif, M. & Nebergall, R. E. (1965). *Attitude and attitude change: The social judgment-involvement approach*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Shipman, F. (2001). Blending the real and virtual: *Activity and spectatorship in fantasy sports*. <http://www.csd.tamu.edu/~shipman/papers/dac01.pdf>. Unpublished manuscript, Texas A&M University.
- Sood, S. & Rogers, E. (2000). Dimensions of parasocial interaction by letter-writers to a Popular entertainment-education soap opera in India. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44, 386-414.
- Trail, G. T., Anderson, D. F. & Fink, J. (2000). A theoretical model of sport spectator consumption behavior. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 3, 154-180.
- 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, 108-126.
- Tsao, J. (1996). Compensatory media use: An exploration of two paradigms. *Communication Studies*, 89, 89-106.
- Walker, D. (2005, August 26). Obsession with online football is no fantasy. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*.
- Walker, J. R. (1990). Time out: Viewing gratifications and reactions to the 1987 NFL players' strike. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 34, 335-350.

- Wann, D. L. (2002). Preliminary validation of a measure for assessing identification as a sport fan: The sport fandom questionnaire. *International Journal of Sport Management, 3*, 103-115.
- Wann, D. L. & Royalty, J. R. (2002). Using motivation and team identification to predict sport fans' emotional responses to team performance. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 25*, 207-216.
- Wann, D. L., Schrader, M. P. & Wilson, A. M. (1999). Sport fan motivation: Questionnaire validation, comparisons by sport, and relationship to athletic motivation. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 22*, 114-139.
- Wann, D. L. (1995). Preliminary validation of the sport fan motivation scale. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 19*, 377-396.
- Wann, D. L. & Dolan, T. J. (1994). Attributions of highly identified sports spectators. *Journal of Social Psychology, 134*, 783-792.
- Wenner, L. & Gantz, W. (1989). The audience experience with sports on television. In L.A. Wenner (Ed.). *Media, sports and society* (pp. 241-268). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wenner, L. (1986). Model specification and theoretical development in gratifications sought and obtained research: A comparison of discrepancy and transactional approaches. *Communication Monographs, 53*, 160-179.
- Windahl, S. (1981). Uses and gratifications at the crossroads. *Mass Communication Review Yearbook, 2*, 174-185.

Windahl S., Hojerback, I. & Hedinsson, E. (1986). Adolescents without television: A study in media deprivation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 30, 47-63.

Zillgett, J. (2000, February 28). We certainly live in a fantasy world. *USA Today*.

Zillmann, D. (1991). The logic of suspense and mystery. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann, *Responding to the screen: Reception and reaction processes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 281-303.

VITA

Troy O'Neill Comeau was born September 25, 1972 in Joplin, Missouri to Jack and Phyllis Comeau. After completing public schooling from Carthage, Missouri in 1990, he received a B.A. in Communication with an emphasis in broadcasting in 1994 from Missouri Southern State University in Joplin, Missouri, a M.A. in Communication in 1997 from Pittsburg State University in Pittsburg, Kansas and a Ph.D. in Communication from the University of Missouri – Columbia in 2007. He married Lorie Watts originally of El Dorado Springs, Missouri in 1993. The couple has one son, Jesse. Presently Troy is an Assistant Professor and Director of Broadcasting at Pittsburg State University.