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ABSTRACT

The notion that loyalty plays a critical role in repeat purchase behavior remains an implicit assumption among scholars. A high degree of loyalty represents the greatest assets a marketer can possess (Engel, Blackwell, & Miniard, 1993). The current economic status of professional and collegiate sport has made it imperative to identify those factors which contribute to loyal consumers. Increased expenditures, competition from various entertainment alternatives, escalating tuition and legislative enactment's (Howard & Crompton, 1995) have combined to make it critical for these organizations to avoid fluctuations in their fan base.

Brand loyalty literature posits operationalizing the construct of loyalty via two independent dimensions: behavioral and attitudinal (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978). Although the attitudinal component precludes direct observation, an attitude's mediational role is inferred from an individual's response to stimulus and predictive of subsequent behavior (Fiske & Taylor, 1992). The present study utilized a (2X2X3) mixed-design ANOVA to identify the underlying structure of loyalty and empirically tests the stability of the attitude-behavior relationship.

An instrument was developed and tested using LISREL 8.0 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) on 379 undergraduates to confirm the measurement and structural model of loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians. Regression analysis indicated that Importance and Direct Experience explained 84% of the variance in behavior and 81% of the variance in
commitment toward the Indians. A multiple discriminant analysis revealed that these two attitude properties could be used to profile students into non, moderate and high loyalty groups with 80% accuracy. 149 students from the original sample were randomly exposed to one of three persuasive messages and re-tested for structural change. Results indicated that subject's level of loyalty moderated changes in attitude structure.

The present study integrated attitude strength and brand loyalty research to diagnose the stability of the underlying structural properties which contribute to loyalty. These results enable sport researchers to develop profiles of cognitive, affective and conative differences for the systematic study of individuals involved in spectator sports as well as various leisure pursuits. Sport managers and marketers can now make informed decisions on how to maintain, enhance and attract a loyal customer base.
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A married couple in Columbus, Ohio planned the birth of their son so as to not coincide with the baseball playoffs in case their favorite team the Cleveland Indians made post season play.

A student at the University of Kansas waited in line 36 hours to buy a basketball ticket in order to drive 800 miles the following weekend to watch the Jayhawks play in the NCAA Regional playoffs.

Cedric Didier traveled four hours from his home outside Paris, France to root for his favorite basketball player Michael Jordan of the Chicago Bulls.

Pablo Hernandez traveled from Bogota, Columbia to Dallas, Texas in order to watch the Brazilian Soccer team play in a 1994 World Cup match.

Brian Weast arranges his work and personal schedule during the NFL and NCAA football season to accommodate watching football games on television.

Since the initial work of Thurstone (1928), Allport (1935), Festinger (1957) and Heider (1958), social psychologist have, "posited attitudes as a nonobservable link between an observable stimulus and an observable response" (Fiske & Taylor, 1992, p. 463). Although attitudes may not be directly observed, they may be inferred from an individual's response to a stimulus and useful in the prediction of subsequent behavior. As the exploits of sport fans in the above passages demonstrate, this type of behavior observed would certainly be indicative of very strong, compelling and positive attitudes
toward a team, player or sport. Furthermore, the strength of that attitude may mediate the attitude-behavior consistency found an individual's loyalty toward an athletic team.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the structural relations among ten attitude properties and their contribution to an individual's loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians professional baseball team. A second purpose of this study was to examine whether the stability of an individual's attitude structure was influenced by the level of loyalty. The present study enables sport researchers to identify the structural composition of loyalty and how various attitude properties crystallize to yield cognitive, affective and conative differences among sport fans.

Sport lore has maintained that fans will venture to great personal and financial lengths to follow and support their favorite athletic team. An individual's desire to become involved in sport and watch others compete in athletic events has a tradition dating back to the time of the ancient Greeks and Romans (Zillman & Paulus, 1993). Spectators from Sparta traveled to Athens in hopes of victory in athletic games, while in Rome spectators cheered their favorite chariot drivers on to victory (Lee, 1983). Throughout the history of sport, loyalty has continued to influence involvement in sport. Although the notion of fan loyalty has existed for centuries, the social-psychological factors that contribute to loyalty has received scant attention.

The pervasiveness of sport in our society has intrigued scholars for the last two decades (e.g. Sage, 1980; Smith, 1988; Zillman & Paulus, 1993). Professional and amateur sports represent a $100 billion dollar industry in the United States (Institute for Sports Advancement, 1995). Approximately 70% of Americans watch, read, or discuss sports at least once a day (Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986). Lieberman (1991) reported that 73% of individuals, in a randomized national sample, indicated they were very interested or at least fairly interested in watching sport. These individuals identify with athletes, empathize with their struggles and share vicariously in their emotions of victory and
defeat. Today, sport spectatorship represents an especially pervasive phenomenon in the
United States (Madrigal, 1995).

Researchers have typically addressed the mass appeal of spectator sport through an
examination of what motivates and sustains sport involvement (Howard & Madrigal,
may involve themselves in sport through actual participation and/or as spectators. There
currently exist numerous opportunities to spectate and participate in sport at the
professional, amateur and recreational levels.

In the area of participatory sports, 7 out of every 10 American adults engaged in
some form of exercise or sport each week (Sage, 1990). Over 235 million Americans
participated in recreational sport activities in 1995 (US Census, 1997). Besides
participation in sport, various other methods exist which enable fans to continue and
maintain their interest and involvement in sport.

These methods include: watching sport on television, listening to sport on the
radio, attending sport events, reading about sports, following sports through electronic
sources and daily sport conversations. Sport spectatorship has reached new heights with
the advent of new communication technology capable of broadcasting live sporting events
via radio and television. Radio stations broadcast over 400,000 hours of sport annually
(Sage, 1990) and the average American watches 178 hours of sports on television each
year (Schaaf, 1997).

Sports programming on the three major networks increased from 300 hours in
1960 to over 1,800 hours in 1988 with 5,000 additional hours broadcast on cable
that over 37,000 hours of sport was broadcast by the four major networks and four cable
sport stations. Furthermore, fans can now watch televised sports events around the clock
via 24-hour sport stations.
In the area of game attendance, sport continues to draw millions of spectators each year. In 1991, over 106 million attended professional basketball, baseball, football and hockey contests while over 74 million attended collegiate football and basketball games (US Census Bureau, 1993). Every four years, over 800 million spectators watch the World Cup (Zillman & Paulus, 1993).

Print mediums represents another method for fans to maintain interest and involvement with sport. Various sport publications (e.g. magazines, newspapers and books) permit fans to continue and maintain their sport experience and interest. In the United States alone, there are over 25,000 mass media outlets such as newspapers, magazines, and book publishers. Over 30% of the American public report purchasing the newspaper for the sport section (Sage, 1990). The sport section in popular newspapers comprises 50% of the non-advertising space and has five times the readership of any other section (Sage, 1990).

Sport interest and involvement has also entered the computer age which allows fans to follow their favorite team, player, sport or activity via various internet sites. Professional and collegiate teams have developed home pages for fans to stay abreast of news related to their favorite team. Fans can also utilize social outlets to ruminate over past games and future contest with friends, colleagues and even strangers.

These various methods enable individuals to maintain their involvement in sport. Fans must invest time, energy, and resources to continue their involvement with a sport, team or player. The stronger one's involvement with a sports team, the more likely the individual will invest emotional as well as monetary resources toward pursuits involving their favorite team (Wann & Branscombe, 1993). This investment in sport manifests itself in daily behavior that may include talking about sports, reading about sports, watching sports on television or in person, listening to radio broadcast, and catching updates of live events via internet sites.
An examination of how individuals spend their time as well as monetary resources provides an indicator as to the importance of sport. From 1985 to 1995, real personal consumption expenditures for sporting and athletic goods grew 3% each year (US Department of Commerce, 1998). The Bureau of Economic Research (1997) estimated US consumers spend over $5.1 billion annually on tickets to sporting events since 1993. From 1990 to 1996, the total annual US sales for licensed sports products bearing collegiate and pro logos jumped 70% from $6.4 billion to $10.9 billion (Heubusch, 1998). In 1989, $11.9 billion was spent by fans attending live sporting events (Bureau of Census, 1989). With so much time, energy and resources invested in sport, it would seem sport spectatorship has indeed become a pervasive phenomenon in our society and worthy of study.

Although spectator sport generates considerable support and interest in our society, individuals differ in their level of involvement. Sport fans can be differentiated by the levels of importance they place on sports. Some individuals are attracted to sports as spectators while others are involved as fans. A sport spectator represents a watcher or observer of a sporting event either in person or through vicarious media outlets, while a fan (i.e. short for fanatic) represents an enthusiastic devotee of a given diversion (Sloan, 1989).

A spectator can watch or attend an athletic event but their emotional involvement and interest in the outcome may be minimal. Pooley (1978) described spectators as individuals who will watch a game but then forget about their experience when the game is completed. In contrast, fans place a great deal of importance on the outcome of the game and will continue to maintain this level of involvement and interest after the event. Fans are required to devote repeated cognitive and behavioral effort in order to maintain this level of high involvement.
Team loyalty represents one factor that may contribute to this continued involvement in sport. Loyalty reflects a social-psychological phenomenon in which individuals form strong, stable and continuous attachments to athletic teams. Individuals form important social identities on the basis of self-categorization which invoke feelings of concern and devotion to the team's well-being (e.g. Brewer, 1991; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). When the Dallas Cowboys lose, "we" lose. When the Charlotte Hornets select their number-one draft pick, part of "our" future is at stake. When the University of Nebraska drew national media criticism for its handling of off-field athlete crimes. Cornhusker fans reacted with righteousness and defensiveness as if the state and its inhabitants were being maligned (Quirk, 1997). Loyal fans develop and express genuine attachment and devotion to their favorite team and/or group of fans. Team loyalty serves to bind an individual as a group member to a team as well as to the group as a whole (Branscombe & Wann, 1990). Despite the pervasiveness of sport in our society, the cognitive, affective and conative differences among sports fans and how these factors contribute to team loyalty has received limited attention.

Statement of the Problem

The current economic status of professional and collegiate sports has made it critical for sport organizations to understand what factors contribute to team loyalty. Traditional franchise revenue sources (i.e. membership fees, gate receipts, concession sales, media sales) are no longer sufficient to cover expenditures (Howard & Crompton, 1995). Professional sport continues to experience financial difficulties as expenditures outpace revenues. In 1993, revenues in professional sports increased 14.6% to $5.1 billion while player costs rose 19.4% to $2.85 billion. This resulted in a 20% reduction in operating income (Ozanian, 1994).
Salaries in professional sport have risen dramatically while attendance and television audiences have stagnated or declined. The average salary of major league baseball players increased 129% while the average salary for national basketball players rose 280% from 1985 to 1995 (Heubusch, 1998). The National Hockey League's regular season television ratings on the Fox network have dwindled from 2.1 in 1995 to 1.7 in 1998 (Sports Illustrated, 1998). This represents a 3.8 million decrease in television viewers. Since 1987, television ratings for professional sports leagues have decreased: Major League Baseball 30%, National Basketball Association 14% and National Football League 22% (McGraw, 1998). Attendance at Major League Soccer games decreased 16% from 1996 to 1997 (Business Week, 1998). Attendance at professional baseball games decreased 12% from 1991 to 1995 (US Census, 1997). Although, the number of football franchises have increased, league wide attendance figures have stagnated for the last five years (US Census, 1997).

Collegiate sport has witnessed a similar trend as expenses have outpaced revenues (Bestwick, 1990). Attendance at collegiate basketball and football events rose 6% from 1990 to 1995 compared to an 11% increase in the number of NCAA teams (US Census Bureau, 1997). Approximately 75% of NCAA Collegiate Division I athletic programs reported annual deficits, while expenditures for NCAA affiliate athletic departments nearly doubled from 1982-1989 (Raiborn, 1990). Competition for support and monetary resources from fans has increased due to increased financial pressure and competition from various other sport entertainment opportunities, escalating tuition cost and legislative enactments (e.g. Title IX) (Howard & Crompton, 1995).

Financial pressures have prompted some professional sport franchises to trade individual athletes to other teams or move the franchise (e.g. Oilers from Houston to Nashville). Fans who were once loyal to a particular team may be forced to sever or transfer their loyalty as the team relocates or changes players. The Brown's move from
Cleveland to Baltimore or the trade which brought Dave Justice to the Cleveland Indians has not been investigated to understand the implications on team loyalty. Today's sport environment raises questions as to the nature of loyalty. Team loyalty may now be affected more by the economics of sports than by geographic location of teams and win/loss records. With the constant flux in franchise rosters and locations, fans may find it difficult to demonstrate loyalty to a team that might not exist next year. Furthermore, the status of professional sports has witnessed the rise of multi-million dollar athletes and spectator loyalty may in part be due to the influence of individual athletes.

Questions remain as to what factors drive attitudes and subsequent behavior in a sport domain and whether these factors are mutually exclusive, inclusive or additive. Currently, behavioral research has failed to contribute to our understanding of the underlying psychological processes of fan loyalty. Zillman and Paulus (1993) state that:

"the conditions that lead to the formation of alliances with athletic teams ... have not been subjected to rigorous examination and are thus poorly understood" (p. 604)

At present in sport, a theoretical framework has not been developed to examine the construct of fan loyalty. The present study recognized the need for a conceptual framework to serve as a foundation for the development of a psychometrically sound scale to assess the complexity of the loyalty construct in sport. The lack of attention given to theoretical frameworks of fan loyalty has led to poorly developed scales or single item measures whose reliability and validity remain in question. Without proper measurement of this construct, a systematic study of fan loyalty can not be conducted.

Sport organizations can ill afford fluctuations in fan support and must develop and maintain a large fan base. Engel, Blackwell, and Miniard (1993) suggest that "a high degree of brand loyalty is one of the greatest assets a marketer can possess" (p.45). Sport managers and marketers can no longer simply categorize individuals through behavioral
market segmentation strategies to differentiate loyalty. In order to promote and maintain a loyal fan base, sport organizations must understand what factors influence team loyalty. The identification of loyal fans represents an important concern in that loyal fans engage in repeat purchase behavior (e.g. purchase of season tickets, watching/listening to games, purchase of sport publications and licensed products).

The study of fan loyalty allows researchers to distinguish between a team's fan base in order to make predictions in terms of antecedents and consequences of loyalty. A central goal for sport marketers involves the development, maintenance and enhancement of loyalty toward a particular team or related sport product. The ability to differentiate fans based upon their attitudinal and behavioral characteristics would allow marketers to segment their fan base into loyalty profiles. The notion that team loyalty plays a critical role in the generation of repeat purchase behavior remains an implicit assumption by academic researchers.

Loyalty

Previous scholars have proposed a multi-dimensional perspective to study the construct of brand loyalty (Day, 1969; Jacoby, 1971; Jacoby & Kyner, 1973; Olson & Jacoby, 1971). This multi-dimensional perspective proposed that brand loyalty consisted of both behavioral and attitudinal components (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978). Since the 1970's, much of the work on consumer loyalty has focused primarily on the refinement of these behavioral and attitudinal components.

In sport related research, the behavioral component of loyalty has been established as the predominant measure of loyalty while the attitudinal component remains undeveloped (Pritchard, 1992). Previous scholars have relied upon repeat patronage of fans (i.e. attendance or proportion of attendance) to operationalize loyalty (Baade & Tiehan, 1990; Becker & Suls, 1983; Hansen & Gauthier, 1989). Sole reliance upon
attendance figures has failed to account for the attitudinal component's contribution to fan loyalty. The use of a single dimension to measure loyalty does not address the complexity of the attitude-behavior relationship which comprises loyalty.

Backman and Crompton (1991b) noted this limitation in the sport leisure industry. Spurious loyal participants were individuals who exhibited high repeat patronage but had a weak psychological attachment toward a sport activity. In contrast, latent loyal participants were individuals who exhibited a strong psychological attachment but did not engage in high repatronage behavior. Backman and Crompton (1991b) suggested that recreational participants could be differentiated by the degree of consistency between psychological attachment and behavior toward a leisure activity. These researchers illustrated the importance of a multi-dimensional or composite perspective to measure loyalty (e.g. Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978).

Previous behavioral measures in sport have utilized descriptive features of loyal fans rather than understanding the psychological process which leads to favorable attitudes (e.g. Baade & Tiehen, 1990; Hansen & Gauthier, 1989). The equivocal results found previously in team loyalty research stem from a lack of theoretical and methodological conceptualization of the loyalty construct (Pritchard, Howard, & Havitz, 1992). These studies have relied upon behavioral measures without the use of a theoretical base to examine the attitudinal component of loyalty.

Pritchard's (1992) work in the leisure industry utilized Crosby and Taylor's (1983) notion of psychological commitment to measure participants commitment to recreational sports programs. Psychological commitment represented a participants' consistency between beliefs and feelings (i.e. affective-cognitive consistency) and resistant to change allegiance to a leisure program. Pritchard (1992) operationalized the attitudinal component of loyalty in terms of the underlying psychological process which leads to
commitment. Commitment was suggested to represent the cognitive, motivational and behavioral consequences of program loyalty (Pritchard et al., 1992).

The use of psychological commitment to operationalize the attitudinal component of team loyalty provided a means to identify attitudinal factors that contribute to differences observed among sport participants. Psychological commitment described the psychological phenomena that underlie loyalty in terms of the relative strength individuals' place on their attitudes toward activity programs. The identification of psychological antecedents related to loyalty provided a means to operationalize the attitudinal component of loyalty.

Mahony (1995, Unpublished) incorporated this attitudinal framework to explore the effects of self-monitoring on team loyalty. Mahony drew upon Pritchard's (1992) operationalization of psychological commitment to examine the effect of self-monitoring on an individual's loyalty to a professional football team. Mahony (1995, unpublished) developed a Psychological Commitment to Team scale (PCT) to measure the resistance of an individual's attitude toward a team.

An individual's continued interest and involvement with an athletic team represents a genuine concern and feeling for a team's activities and well-being. This type of attachment reflects a faithfulness toward a team which should manifest a consistency between attitudes and behavior. Although the relationship between attitudes and behavior can often times be ambiguous, a growing body of research has supported the notion that strong attitudes are more likely to explain behavior than weak attitudes (Ajzen & Madden, 1986; Fazio & Zanna, 1978a; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Haugtvedt, Schumann, Schmeier & Warren, 1994; Kroscnick, 1988b; Petty, Cacioppo, Schumann, 1983). Taken together, this body of evidence suggests that individual behavior can be explained and predicted by reports of attitudes especially when these attitudes are strong.
Attitudes of Sports Fans

Loyal fans are likely to possess both strong positive attitudes toward a particular team and demonstrate some form of consistent repeat patronage behavior. Fans who routinely exhibit repatronage toward a team would likely possess attitudes which are consistent with behavior. Attitude refers to a general and enduring positive or negative feeling about some person, object or issue that serves important psychological functions which have the ability to direct behaviors (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). A considerable amount of research conducted in the area social psychology has demonstrated that strong attitudes have more of an impact than weak attitudes on cognitive processes and social behavior (e.g. Petty & Krosnick, 1995; Raden, 1985; Scott, 1968).

Social psychologists have traditionally conceptualized attitude strength in terms of various attitude properties: extremity, accessibility, importance, intensity, certainty, ego-involvement, knowledge, direct experience, personal relevance, affective-cognitive consistency, ambivalence, involvement, centrality, ego-preoccupation, salience, and vested interest (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995; Raden, 1985; Scott, 1968). The relationship among these properties has presented researchers with some what of a structural paradox (i.e. related, yet distinct properties) which has been the focus of recent theoretical and empirical attention (Abelson, 1988; Bassili, 1996; Krosnick et al., 1993; Verplanken, 1991). Krosnick et al., (1993) analyzed ten dimensions of attitude strength and found low to moderate correlations among most of the properties. Taken together, this body of evidence demonstrated that although the properties are related, they represent distinct and independent dimensions of an individual's attitude.

The conceptualization of various attitude strength properties as independent provides a means to examine their impact on attitude persistence, resistance, cognition and
behavior. Persistence relates to stability and the degree to which an individual's attitude has remained unchanged over an extended period of time regardless if it has been attacked directly or not (Abelson, 1988; Haugtvedt et al., 1994; Krosnick, 1988a; Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995). Resistance refers to the ability of an attitude to withstand an attack when challenged (Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Haugtvedt et al., 1994; Wood & Kallgren, 1988). Loyal fans should possess attitudes that are persistent and resistant and more predictive of behavior (e.g. Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995).

Attitudes may also impact cognition by influencing the information processing and judgments made in regards to information (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1986b). Strong attitudes toward a particular object (i.e. team) make it more likely certain information will come to mind or certain decisions will be rendered (Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Haugtvedt et al., 1994). When attitudes are strong they are more likely to impact a bias in information processing activity and judgment than weak attitudes (Petty, Cacioppo & Schumann, 1983; Schumann, Petty & Clemmons, 1990).

Continued loyalty towards an athletic team should reflect attitudes that have crystallized and consistent with behavior. Crystallized attitudes are more likely to guide behavior and represent an attitude-behavior consistency than weak attitudes (Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995). Behavior towards the team should be accompanied by attitudes that possess features of durability and impactfulness (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Fan loyalty would represent a consistency between behavior and attitudes that manifest persistence, resistance, and impact cognition.

**Loyalty and Attitudes**

Previous studies in sport have primarily utilized behavioral measures to examine fan loyalty. These measures have not addressed the social-psychological factors that influence loyalty. The present study integrates attitude strength literature to explore the
impact that strong attitudes have on team loyalty. Attitudes of sport fans can be
diagnosed and profiled to understand the influence of various attitude strength properties
on behavior. The adoption of an attitude strength perspective would enable sport
researchers and organizations alike to investigate those factors that influence, maintain and
enhance loyalty to athletic teams.

This cognitive perspective would further our understanding of the dynamics
associated with fan loyalty. Fan loyalty can now be operationalized as a product of the
consistency between a fan's behavior and attitudes supported by high levels on various
attitude properties. These attitude properties should in turn manifest attitudes that are
persistent, resistant, impact cognition and guide behavior. This implies that for a fan to
exhibit loyalty to a sports team he or she would do so in response to cognitive, affective-
evaluative, and predispositional factors that reflect the essential characteristics of an
attitude (e.g. Jacoby, 1971).

The variability associated with an individual's attitude toward any object reflects
structural differences in various attitude properties (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). For
example, loyal Dallas Cowboys fans would likely have attitudes that are intense, extreme,
supported by extensive knowledge, held with great certainty, and highly important.
Whereas unloyal Cowboys fans, would likely have attitudes that are moderate to low in
extremity and intensity, unimportant, personally irrelevant, and based upon little previous
knowledge.

Loyalty would likely represent a strong attachment, allegiance and faithfulness to a
sports team and reflect the degree and extent to which certain attitude properties are held.
However, previous research has not examined how variability in loyalty is related to
various attitude properties. Although previous research has demonstrated that these
strength properties are moderately correlated, each one represents a distinct property that
contributes to attitude strength (Krosnick et al., 1993). In a sport domain, the
investigation of how various attitude properties relate to loyalty in athletic teams would provide insight into the structural composition of loyalty. Furthermore, it would allow loyalty to be operationalized in terms of attitude strength features to explore the generality of the attitudinal construct for research aimed at fan loyalty.

Implications

The goal of the present study was to initiate a program of research to explore the phenomenon of fan loyalty. The utilization of an attitude perspective provides researchers with a framework to examine the social-psychological processes that contribute to loyalty. In a sport domain, the study of team loyalty should be carefully guided by general theoretical frameworks from brand loyalty and attitude strength research. Sport researchers would be provided with a cognitive interpretation of loyalty to explore the attitude-behavior relationship within a sport domain.

The investigation of psychological factors which influence loyalty provides insight into the cognitive, motivational and behavioral consequences of team loyalty. This involves not only the identification of repeat patronage, but also those factors that induce behavior toward sport activities, teams or athletes. Despite the pervasiveness and the magnitude of sport spectatorship, there currently exist a dearth in the literature as to how and why fans develop and maintain strong attitudes toward particular sports teams. Future research must address attitudinal differences among sports fans and how these differences contribute to various levels of team loyalty.

This line of research could be expanded to identify the level at which various attitude properties impact variability in loyalty to players, commercial recreation programs, and consumer sport products. Future research could also proceed to investigate the process through which these various attitude properties form and crystallize in regards to new athletic teams. The psychological factors associated with
loyalty can be linked to a model of attitude change in order to predict how certain attitude properties influence the formation of loyalty.

At present, there is a lack of knowledge as to how "attitudes are initially formed, they evidently go through some transition in terms of the structure in order to develop the characteristics ordinarily associated with strong attitudes" (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). This program of research could provide a line of inquiry which extends our current knowledge of attitude formation through an examination of the stability of the attitudinal structure found in fan loyalty. Furthermore, this line of research could be expanded to address how personality variables (i.e. need for cognition, self-esteem) moderate loyalty.

This line of inquiry enables researchers to diagnose sport fans in terms of valence and degree of attitudinal properties. Attitudes of loyal fans may differ from moderate and unloyal fans on levels of certainty, knowledge, intensity, importance, etc. For example, moderate fans may be less certain of their attitudes and lack knowledge to support their attitudes than highly allegiant fans. Loyalty to a team might then be induced or increased by bolstering those properties via various marketing and promotional techniques.

Sport researchers would be able profile fans based upon the structure of their loyalty and test persuasive messages to make informed decision on how sport organizations can avoid fluctuations in their loyal fan base. An individual's attitude structure may influence decisions about type, amount, and exposure frequency of promotional material necessary to maintain or change existing behavior. The escalating costs associated with the operation of professional franchises, collegiate programs, recreation activities as well as private businesses have made it necessary for these organizations to create and maintain a loyal customer base. The growing trend of consumer micro-segmentation has increased interest in theoretically guided models that enable researchers and practitioners alike to develop profiles of differences in attitude preference and formation (e.g. Haugtvedt, Petty, & Cacioppo, 1992).
There are a number of practical benefits which can be derived from an examination of attitude structure related to loyalty. Sport marketers and managers would be able to classify fans into loyalty categories and target specific fans through various marketing techniques. Mullin et al., (1993) proposed a "20-80 RULE" for sport organizations in which 20% of an organization's clients account for 80% of the total business. Individuals in the 20% category were defined as heavy to moderate users and represented an organizations loyal customer base. Sport organization could now identify their moderate users and develop marketing strategies to increase usage patterns.

Framework of Study

The independent variables in this study were: extremity, intensity, certainty, importance, personal relevance, knowledge, accessibility, direct experience, latitude of rejection, and affective-cognitive consistency. The independent variables were operationalized by scores on a 59-item questionnaire developed for the present study. The dependent variable in this study was team loyalty. Team loyalty was operationalized by scores on a 17-item fan loyalty scale developed for this study. Phase I of the present study examined the relationship between ten attributes or properties of attitude strength and two features of loyalty: resistance and behavior.

LISREL 8.0 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) was employed to test the structural and measurement model of fan loyalty against the data collected. Multiple regression analysis was utilized to examine the influence that the ten independent variables had on the attitude and behavior components of loyalty. Multiple Discriminant analysis was conducted on the team loyalty measure and attitude strength measures to diagnose structural composition of attitude properties and develop profiles of fan loyalty.

A 2 x 2 x 3(Week 3 vs. Week 8 x High vs. Low Loyalty x Pro vs. Counter vs. Control Article) mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to
investigate the affects of a persuasive communication on the stability of each attitude property. Experimental methodology from the Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b) was utilized to induce attitude change and to examine the affect that loyalty had information processing.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was explore the structural relations among ten attitude properties and their affect on features of team loyalty. This study explored whether differences in team loyalty could be explained by the structural relations among latent attitude properties. A second purpose of this study was to examine the stability of attitude properties and whether changes in attitudinal structure could be experimentally induced.

Research Questions:

The study was designed to answer the following four questions:

Research Question 1:
To what extent can latent attitude properties be used to predict behavioral and attitudinal differences in an individual's loyalty toward an athletic team?

Research Question 2:
To what extent can attitude properties be used to develop profiles of fan loyalty?

Research Question 3:
What is the relative contribution of various attitude properties on team loyalty?

Research Question 4:
To what extent does an individual's loyalty toward an athletic team moderate the stability of attitude properties?
Hypotheses:

Based upon previous research, four hypotheses were offered.

Hypothesis 1:

Properties of attitude strength can be used to predict behavioral and attitudinal differences in an individual's loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians.

Hypothesis 2:

Significant differences are expected in structural composition of the ten latent attitude properties between high, moderate and low allegiant individuals.

Hypothesis 3:

The psychological significance and value (i.e. importance) a fan places in their attitude toward the Cleveland Indians will be the most influential attitude property to identify level of loyalty.

Hypothesis 4:

The level of an individual's loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians will moderate the stability of attitude structure when exposed to a persuasive appeal.

Overview of the Chapters

Chapter 1 provided an introduction leading to the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, a model of fan loyalty, the research questions and hypotheses. Chapter 2 examines previous literature and research findings of related studies. Chapter 3 pertains to the methodology used which includes descriptions of the research design, instrumentation and scale development, selection of the sample, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures. Results are reported in Chapter 4 and a discussion of the results comprise Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The present study explored the structural relations among various attitude properties and loyalty toward an athletic team. The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of previous literature related to the research questions presented in Chapter 1. This chapter begins with a review of brand loyalty and attitude change literature. The theoretical implications of attitude strength on team loyalty are next discussed. The chapter then provides an integrated perspective to serve as a framework to develop a conceptual model of fan loyalty. The chapter concludes with a review of methodology used for the experimental portion of the study. This review integrates a variety of literature from disciplines in consumer behavior, business, education, marketing, and social psychology to serve as a framework for the present study.

Loyalty

The construct of loyalty has intrigued scholars over the last four decades and continues to generate a considerable amount of research. Much of this work has been based upon the notion of brand loyalty. Brand loyalty research initially dated back to Copeland's (1923) investigation of brand insistence where loyalty was conceptualized as an attitudinal continuum stretching from recognition of a brand through differing degrees of preference to insistence. However, this attitudinal perspective remained largely unexplored as researchers turned their investigation of loyalty towards operationalizing brand loyalty in terms of behavioral indice (Cunningham, 1956; Tucker, 1964).
It was not until the late 1960's that the attitudinal component of loyalty was integrated with the behavioral component to understand the phenomenon of brand loyalty (Day, 1969; Engel, Kollat, & Blackwell, 1968; Jacoby, 1971; Jacoby & Olson, 1970). Since the 1970's, brand loyalty has been operationalized in terms of two distinct components: a behavioral dimension and an attitudinal dimension (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978; Jacoby & Kyner, 1973; Jacoby & Olson, 1970). Although a general and accepted definition of loyalty has yet to be established, Jacoby and Chestnut's (1978) definition of brand loyalty remains one of the most comprehensive. Jacoby and Chestnut (1978) defined brand loyal behavior as "the overt act of selective repeat purchasing based on evaluative psychological decision processes" (p. 19).

Previous work on loyalty originated from marketing research in the context of brand loyalty. Brand loyalty research initially reflected an examination of loyalty in the context of frequently purchased low priced, high volume package goods. Loyalty was regarded as a critical aspect to generate repeat purchase behavior. Marketing researchers initially focused upon customers' loyalty to products (e.g. toothpaste and detergents) or services (e.g. banking and travel) but has since been expanded to include vendor loyalty, store loyalty and various aspects of consumer behavior. Crosby and Taylor (1983) utilized brand loyalty research to investigate preference stability among voters and drew a parallel between voting behavior and consumer behavior. Recent research in the leisure industry has drawn upon brand loyalty research to measure loyalty of consumers to tourism as well as recreational programs and activities (Backman, 1991; Backman & Crompton; 1991a, 1991b; Howard, Edginton, & Selin, 1988; Pritchard, 1992; Pritchard, Howard, & Havitz, 1992; Selin, Howard, Udd, & Cable, 1988).

Although brand loyalty research has been widely used to study aspects of consumer behavior in numerous contexts, its application to team sports has rarely been used to investigate an individual's loyalty toward an athletic team. The most common
form of measuring loyalty to an athletic team has relied primarily upon behavioral measures drawn from game attendance figures (Baade & Tiehan, 1990; Becker & Suls, 1984; Greenstein & Marcum, 1981; Hansen & Gauthier, 1989). Murrell and Dietz (1992) were the first to utilize an attitudinal and behavioral index to examine individual differences in team support and equated fan attendance with loyalty. Mahony (1995, Unpublished) was the first to integrate the construct of brand loyalty to examine individual differences in fan loyalty to professional football teams.

Sport fans are notorious for exhibitions of loyal and disloyal behavior. However, this behavior has rarely been examined in the context of brand loyalty. The lack of attention given to the investigation of fan loyalty may have emerged from the reliance upon game attendance figures to differentiate loyalty. The problems encountered by sport researchers were similar to those faced by other scholars in regard to the conceptual and methodological issues related to the construct of loyalty. The concept of brand loyalty has been the topic of interest and debate among investigators for decades. Much of this debate surrounded the conceptualization of loyalty and how it was operationalized.

Jacoby and Chestnut (1978) addressed the operationalization of loyalty through an examination how researchers attached numbers in some meaningful way to brand loyalty. They suggested that a deterministic process of loyalty should be utilized, based primarily upon the psychological process that encompassed beliefs, attitudes and intentions to repurchase. Through their review of literature, these authors identified two basic assumptions that were used to measure brand loyalty. The first assumption dealt with the level at which brand loyalty was measured. Brand loyalty was measured either at the micro level (i.e. individual consumer) or at the macro level (i.e. aggregate number of consumers). Cognitive and behavioral activity measures were utilized at the micro level but not at the macro level.
The second assumption of brand loyalty dealt with the type of data examined at three levels. The first level examined repeat purchase behavior of some brand while the cognitive processes involved were ignored. The second level examined the cognitive process of decision-making such as psychological commitment while behavioral outcomes were ignored. The third level attempted to blend the behavioral and attitudinal data into a composite measure. Hence, three categories existed to develop operational measures: behavioral, attitudinal and composite (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978).

Olson and Jacoby (1971) utilized 12 specific loyalty measures of 177 brands of toothpaste to examine the construct validity of brand loyalty; but found inconclusive results. Their findings suggested that measures of brand loyalty which relied primarily upon behavioral outcomes were inadequate without an examination of the underlying reasons for loyalty. In response, they offered a conceptual definition of brand loyalty based upon the premise that brand loyalty was but one form of repeat purchase behavior. Jacoby and Olson (1970) conceptualized brand loyalty as a phenomena expressed by a set of six necessary and collective conditions. Brand loyalty was: 1) a biased, 2) behavioral response, 3) expressed over time, 4) made by some decision-making unit, 5) with respect to one or more alternative brands out of a set of such brands, and 6) a function of psychological (i.e. decision-making, evaluative) process.

A definition of brand loyalty which incorporated these six conditions provided a framework that specified what must be measured. The first condition suggested that loyalty represented a biased event and difficult to measure because the event was not controllable or predictable. The second condition proposed that behavioral response measures (i.e. statements of purchase intention) alone were not adequate to measure brand loyalty due to biases in verbal self-reports. The third condition stipulated that multiple measures should be utilized at different points in time since loyalty connoted a condition of some duration. The fourth condition implied that measures should differentiate between
actual user and purchaser of the product to fully understand all who participated in the
decision-making process. The fifth condition recognized that individuals were multi-brand
loyal and that there must be a choice between competing alternatives. The sixth condition
indicated that measures should identify the salient criteria utilized to select a particular

Jacoby and Kyner (1973) attempted to empirically verify Jacoby and Olson's
(1970) conceptualization of brand loyalty to distinguish between band loyalty and repeat
purchase behavior. Although their investigation was not able to confirm all six conditions,
they concluded that simple repeat purchase behavior and brand loyalty were functionally
two different phenomena. These results indicated that an examination of loyalty must
incorporate measures of repeat purchase behavior as well as the reasons which underlay
such behavior.

Behavioral Dimension

In a review of loyalty literature, Engel, Kollat, and Blackwell (1968) noted that
most attention had focused on behavioral outcomes without consideration for the reasons
or explanations underlying brand loyalty. Jacoby and Chestnut (1978) noted in previous
loyalty studies that 53 different operational definitions of brand loyalty appeared in the
literature. Approximately 60% of the measures utilized behavioral data. The behavioral
dimension required that an individual repurchase the same brand consistently. Many
researchers prior to the late 1960's utilized only behavioral measures to operationalize
brand loyalty. Tucker (1964) proposed that loyalty existed only when a consumer
purchased a particular brand three or more times in row. Cunningham (1956) suggested
that loyalty represented the, "proportion of total purchases represented by the largest
single brand used." (p. 118).
Behavioral indices generally were data taken from consumers' overt behavior and self-report measures and then divided into five categories: 1) proportion of purchase devoted to a given brand (e.g. market share, exclusive purchase), 2) sequence in which brands were purchased (i.e. divided and unstable loyalty), 3) probability of purchase (e.g. repeat and return purchase probability, 4) a combination of several behavioral criteria (i.e. loyalty index), and 5) miscellaneous measures (e.g. lost-gained ratio) (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978). Although there existed numerous behavioral indice, two commonalties existed among them. Brand loyalty involved: 1) a behavior itself (e.g. purchase of a product, ticket, apparel, attendance at a sports event), and 2) a behavior that was expressed with some duration (i.e. expressed over time).

The sole reliance upon these behavioral measures to operationalize loyalty came under criticism in the late 1960's (Day, 1969; Engel, Kollet & Blackwell, 1968; Jacoby, 1971; Jacoby & Kyner, 1973; Jacoby and Olson, 1970; Olson & Jacoby, 1971). Scholars criticized the use of the uni-dimensional approach and advocated a new multi-dimensional perspective to investigate brand loyalty. The reliance upon behavioral criteria were inadequate to understand why the phenomenon of loyalty existed. Day (1969) offered a two-dimensional concept of brand loyalty to improve loyalty measures, noting that, "there is more to brand loyalty than just consistent buying of the same brand - attitudes, for instance." (p. 29) The implication of this conceptualization was that measures of loyalty should not solely rely upon a single behavioral or attitudinal criterion.

A second weakness was noted in the loyalty literature by Jacoby (1971) in that previous definitions of loyalty were essentially operational instead of conceptual. This contributed to the absence of any definitive conclusions in regards to the relationship between brand loyalty and other variables. Jacoby (1971) noted that repeat purchase was a necessary but not a sufficient condition to establish brand loyalty and attitudes by themselves did not invariable lead to behavior.
Backman and Crompton (1991b) within the leisure industry demonstrated that some participants exhibited high behavioral loyalty toward an activity but were low in psychological attachment (i.e. attitudinal loyalty). These participants were labeled "spuriously loyal." Furthermore, these researchers identified individuals who exhibited low behavioral loyalty but were high in attitudinal loyalty. These participants were labeled "latently loyal."

Researchers began to differentiate between intentional and spurious loyal consumers to understand the differences between brand loyalty and simple repeat purchase behavior. True loyalty was thought to exist only when an individual exhibited both behavioral and attitudinal loyalty. Thus, an individual who was loyal would exhibit high levels of repeat behavior as well as a strong attitudes toward an object. Jacoby (1971) conceptualized brand loyalty as characteristic of an attitude and stated that, "to exhibit brand loyalty implies repeat purchasing behavior based on cognitive, affective-evaluate, and pre-dispositional factors--the classical primary components of an attitude." (p. 26). This attitudinal perspective proposed the use of behavioral and attitudinal criteria to evaluate loyalty. Hence, for brand loyalty to exist, two primary conditions must be present: brand loyal behavior and brand loyal attitudes.

Attitudinal Dimension

Although behavioral indices were satisfactory for prediction of subsequent purchase behavior, they provided little information as to the underlying factors that contributed to the development and modification of brand loyalty. Of the 53 operational definitions examined by Jacoby and Chestnut (1978), 12 utilized attitudinal measures exclusively (i.e. less than 25%). This attitudinal data reflected preference statements or statements of likely behavior (i.e. brand preference). The attitudinal dimension had generally examined individual's beliefs, intentions, and feelings related to some object.
Attitudes represented the psychological construct that was considered the most suited to provide information on underlying factors. In this context, behavior was thought to reflect a positive attitude toward the brand and one that was relatively stable (Jacoby & Kyner, 1973).

One important consideration that emerged from Jacoby and Kyner (1973) was the notion that commitment needed to be conceptually elaborated upon to provide a means to distinguish among different degrees of brand loyalty. They suggested that as a result of the decision-making evaluative process, an individual developed a degree of commitment which reflected loyalty to a brand. Commitment provided a basis to distinguish between brand loyalty and other forms of repeat purchase behavior. Day's (1969) proposed two-dimensional concept of brand loyalty indicated that loyalty was based upon a rational decision that reflected a commitment to the brand, that no longer required an extensive decision-making process and produced a strong affective orientation toward the brand.

Crosby and Taylor (1983) suggested that loyalty represented the psychological decision-making and evaluative processes that led to brand commitment. Psychological commitment referred to the "tendency to resist change in preference in response to conflicting information or experience" (Crosby & Taylor, 1983, p. 414). This implied that the attitudinal dimension reflected a decision-making unit's psychological involvement and commitment to the brand that reflected the strength of attitudes held about that brand.

This multi-dimensional perspective indicates that within a sport domain, loyal fans would likely possess both strong positive attitudes toward a particular team and demonstrate repeat patronage behavior. Fans who routinely exhibit a behavior are likely to express attitudes that they apparently consider extremely important. Attitudes refer to a general and enduring positive or negative feeling about some person, object or issue that serve important psychological functions and have the ability to direct behaviors. (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981.) Eagly and Chaiken (1993) defined an attitude as a "psychological
tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor" (p. 1). Attitudes continue to serve a variety of roles for individuals: as convenient summaries for beliefs (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) and express some important aspect of one's personality (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

Social psychologists have continued to focus their attention upon the concept of attitude due the assumption that attitudes were related to behavior. However, early work on the attitude-behavior relationship produced ambiguous results and demonstrated that attitudes were poor predictors of behavior (Corey, 1937; LaPiere, 1934; Wicker, 1969). These results were due in part to the use of general attitude measures to predict specific types of behavior.

However, this negative sentiment toward attitude research faded as researchers began to explore conditions under which attitudes were likely to be related to behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1974; Davidson & Jaccard, 1979). Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) argued that attitude measures were useful to predict behavior provided that four elements were considered: 1) the action performed (i.e. watching a football game), 2) the target at which the action was performed, (i.e. the action was directed at the Cowboys), 3) the context in which the action took place (i.e. on television or at a stadium) and 4) the time when the action was performed, (i.e. during a Sunday afternoon).

A stronger attitude-behavior correspondence could be observed by measuring each specific element, watching the Cowboys on television during Sunday afternoon. Based upon the work of Ajzen and Fishbein (1977), Davidson and Jaccard (1979), Fazio and Zanna (1978a), Snyder (1979), and other earlier attitude scholars, attitudes are now believed to serve important functions for people that can be measured with high reliability and validity and useful to predict behavior (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).
Attitudes and Sports Fans

A fundamental question raised by the attitudinal component of loyalty involves understanding why some individuals care more deeply about some attitudes than others. Those factors which account for variation in attitudes and prompt some fans to engage continually in dramatic, passionate and enduring behavior toward a team would have to be identified. The integration of theoretical frameworks from social psychology in the area of attitude strength provide a means to understand such variation among attitudes of sport fans.

In the context of team sports, as well as other aspects of daily life, individuals routinely demonstrate behavior that express strong attitudes. Sport fans who routinely sit through Green Bay Packer games in sub-freezing temperature would apparently care deeply about their attitudes toward the Packers. The anti-abortionist or animal activist who protests in support of their causes would seem to have particularly strong attitudes toward these issues. While some individuals are deeply committed and invested in their attitudes on certain topics others remain relatively unmoved on these same issues.

Thus, it would seem that some individuals place a great deal of significance upon certain attitudes while attaching little or no significance upon other attitudes. In the social science literature, such variability in an individual's attitude toward an object has been attributed to various properties of an individual's attitude. A substantial amount of research in the area of social psychology has demonstrated that attitudes properties that were crystallized (i.e. strong) have a greater impact than weak attitudes on cognitive processes and social behavior (e.g. Krosnick and Petty, 1995; Raden, 1985; Scott, 1968).

Attitude Properties

Previous studies in attitude research have investigated various properties of attitudes that were assumed to be related with strength consequences (i.e. behavior).
These properties represented dimensions or structural properties of attitude strength. Scott (1968) identified ten attributes or dimensions related to strong attitudes: extremity, flexibility, consciousness, cognitive complexity, intensity, ambivalence, affective salience, embeddedness, salience, and overtness. Raden (1985) later expanded the number of attributes to include: accessibility, evaluative-cognitive consistency, certainty, direct behavioral experience, importance, latitudes of acceptance and rejection and vested interest. Krosnick et al. (1993) identified ten dimensions that have received considerable theoretical and empirical attention: extremity, intensity, certainty, importance, interest in relevant information, knowledge, accessibility, direct experience, latitude of rejection and non-commitment and affective-cognitive consistency.

Krosnick and Petty (1995) have indicated that four general strength related dimensions can been used to categorize various attitude properties: 1) aspects of the attitude itself, 2) cognitive structure, 3) subjective beliefs and 4) processes. Aspects of an attitude itself represented attitudes that existed on an evaluative continuum which ranged from positive to negative and included valence and extremity attributes. Aspects of attitude structure reflected the existence of attitudes within a network of associative links that connected attitudes to other cognitive elements which included attributes of accessibility, knowledge, consistency, direct experience and ambivalence.

Subjective beliefs represent those beliefs held by individuals about the attributes of their own attitudes as well as the attributes of the attitude object. Individuals perceived some attitude objects as closely associated with important personal goals, desires and wishes and included personal relevance, certainty, and personal importance. The last strength related dimension was processes. This dimension reflected individuals attention to particular characteristics of an attitude such as the cognitive process by which attitudes were formed. Within this category were cognitive process models such as the Elaboration

**Strength Related Consequences**

Krosnick and Petty (1995) after a review of attitude strength literature proposed that although attitude properties and their strength related dimension were viewed as conceptually and empirically distinct, they all have been linked to four defining features of a strong attitude (i.e. strength related consequences). An attitude was considered strong to the extent that it possessed two features: durability and impactfulness (Boninger, et al., 1995; Krosnick & Petty, 1995). The two manifestations of durability were persistence and resistance and the two manifestations of impactfulness were impact of cognition and behavior.

These four aspects of an attitude represented defining features of strength that were affected by the various attitude properties (i.e. extremity, knowledge, importance, certainty, etc.). Numerous studies have investigated these strength related consequences in attempts to distinguish the determinants of attitude strength (Boninger et al., 1995; Krosnick et al., 1993; Krosnick & Petty, 1995; Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995).

In the sport domain, a high degree of team loyalty would likely be accompanied by an attitude that was persistent, resistant and predictive of behavior. Loyalty toward a particular athletic team would likely be determined by the relative strength of each attitude property and whether these properties manifested durable and impactful consequences. Loyal fans would possess attitude properties that differ from moderate or low loyal fans in terms of the degree of durability and impactfulness. The type of variation observed among sport fans would be indicative of how passionately and deeply committed some fans are to their attitudes in regards to an athletic team. In order for fans to demonstrate loyalty to a
team, they must possess attitudes that persist overtime, resist change and which have an impact on cognition and behavior.

Persistence reflects stability and refers to the degree to which a fan's attitudes toward a team would remain unchanged over an extended period of time regardless if the attitudes have been attacked directly or not (e.g. Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995). Strong attitudes are expected to persist more than weak attitudes. Studies of attitude persistence generally assessed an attitude at one point and then reassessed it at a latter point in time. Persistence was estimated by the correlation between the two measures (Schuman & Presser, 1981). Recent work in consumer behavior questions the sole reliance upon persistence to assess attitude strength (Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994). Erber, Hodges and Wilson (1995) suggested that attitudes may fluctuate over time depending upon what people happen to be thinking about at a given time. Although an attitude may exhibit a duration aspect, it should be considered strong only when it was combined with resistance to change. The overall durability of attitudes are dependent upon the presence of persistence and resistance consequences (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Fans whose attitudes toward a team are durable should manifest behavior that is both persistent and resistant.

Resistance refers to that attitude's ability to withstand an attack when challenged (Krosnick & Petty, 1995; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b; Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995). Evident in the attitude change literature was a common theme that strong attitudes were not easily changed. Resistance has been measured by an examination of the extent to which an attitude changed when a respondent was exposed to persuasive messages (Ewing, 1942) or when participants were instructed to think about reasons for their attitudes (Erber, Hodges & Wilson, 1995).

Resistance to change has been suggested to be the general underlying factor for attitude strength which contributes to consumer commitment (Crosby & Taylor, 1983;
Eagly & Chaiken, 1995; Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Pritchard, 1992; Pritchard et al., 1992). Eagly and Chaiken (1995) speculated that resistance to change produces change in the other three attitude features and represented attitude strength's critical consequence. Their structural theory of attitude strength explained the mechanisms by which people avoided changes to their attitudes and suggested that selectivity in information processing occurred because it facilitated resistant to change (Eagly & Chaiken, 1995).

The notion that resistance to change contributes to loyalty has been elaborated upon in the leisure industry (Howard, Edginton, & Selin, 1988; Pritchard, 1992; Pritchard, Howard, & Havitz, 1992). Pritchard (1992) incorporated Crosby and Taylor's (1983) psychological commitment to develop an instrument to assess loyalty. Commitment had been identified as representing the psychological processes which forms the attitudinal component of loyalty (Day, 1969; Jacoby, 1971; Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978; Jacoby & Kyner, 1973). Psychological commitment was believed to be a critical component for operationalizing the attitudinal component to measure loyalty to leisure goods and services (Pritchard, Howard, & Havitz, 1992).

The notion that persistence and especially resistance were useful in operationalizing the attitudinal component of loyalty has received considerable attention in the literature. However, the reliance upon these durability features alone is not sufficient to measure loyal attitudes of consumers. A full understanding of the attitudinal component of loyalty requires an examination of the impact that various attitude properties have on cognition and behavior in addition to durability features. In the context of attitude strength, attitude persistence and resistance represent the durability of the attitude property while an attitude's influence on information processing, judgments and behavior represent an "impactful" quality (Boninger et al., 1995; Boninger, Krosnick, Berent, & Faber, 1995; Krosnick, 1988a, 1988b; Krosnick et al., 1993; Krosnick & Petty, 1995; Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995).
Thus, persistence and resistance refer to two features of durability within the attitudinal component of loyalty. A third feature of the attitudinal component is an attitudes influence on cognition. "Impactful" attitudes are those attitudes that influence an individual's cognition and behavior (Boninger et al., 1995; Krosnick & Petty, 1995). An individual's attitude influences cognition through the extent of information processing and judgments made concerning information (Festinger, 1957; Petty, Cacioppo, Schumann, 1983; Schumann, Petty & Clemons, 1990). Strong attitudes toward a particular object make it more likely that certain information will come to mind or that certain decision will be rendered (Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1986b; Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995). When attitudes are strong they are more likely to create a bias in information processing activity and judgment than weak attitudes (Fazio & Williams, 1986; Haugtvedt et al., 1994; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Houston & Fazio, 1989; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b).

Besides their influence on cognition, strong attitudes are likely to affect the consistency between attitudes and behavior. Behavior towards an attitude object was more likely to be guided by strong attitudes than weak attitudes (Davidson, 1995; Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995). The relationship between attitudes and behavior reflects previously held strong attitudes that were more likely to guide behavior and represents attitude-behavior consistency (Ajzen & Madden, 1986; Fazio, 1995; Miller & Grush, 1986). Measurements of the attitude-behavior relationship have typically used self-report measures and asked respondents to report past behaviors or behavioral intentions in regards to future behavior (Miller & Grush, 1986) providing subjects with an opportunity to perform a given behavior (Weigel & Newman, 1976), or compared behaviors with previous attitude measurements (Ajzen & Madden, 1986).

Previous attitude strength research has focused primarily upon the relationship between a single attitude property and its relationship with durability and impactfulness.
However, recent work by Krosnick et al., (1993) and Bassili (1996) have created interest in the structural relations among multiple attitude properties and strength related consequences. Furthermore, Krosnick and Petty (1995) have suggested that "valuable new insights can be produced by multivariate studies considering many dimensions simultaneously" (p. 19). The purpose of the present study was to extend recent efforts and explore the structural relations among various attitude properties and how these attitude properties contribute to differences in team loyalty. In the context of fan loyalty, loyal fans would be assumed to possess attitudes that differ from moderate to low fans by the degree to which various attitude properties influence their attitudes. Ten dimensions were investigated in this study: extremity, intensity, certainty, importance, personal relevance, knowledge, accessibility, direct experience, latitude of rejection and affective-cognitive consistency.

**Attitude Importance**

Attitude importance refers to the degree to which an individual considers an attitude to be personally important. This importance represents a person's perception of the psychological significance and value attached to an attitude. Krosnick (1989) defined attitude importance as attitudes that individuals attach personal importance and care deeply about. Krosnick (1988a) demonstrated that important attitudes toward governmental policies during the 1980 and 1984 presidential election campaigns were more stable than unimportant attitudes. Krosnick (1989) proposed that the greater accessibility of important attitudes resulted from these attitudes being, "more frequent subjects of conscious thought, involve stronger affective reactions, and are more extensively linked to other attitudes, beliefs, and values in memory" (p. 305). Important attitudes should be highly intercorrelated because they are extensively linked to other
cognitive components such as other values, attitudes and self-concept (Judd & Krosnick, 1982; Schuman & Presser, 1981).

Attitude importance was thought to be a result of involvement (Ostrom & Brock, 1968) which increased the extent to which important attitudes were related to more important values, a larger numbers of values, and highly relevant values. The psychological significance individuals place on their attitudes should produce more resistant attitudes. Importance of an attitude has been found to increase attitude resistance and reduce attitude change (Ewing, 1942; Fine, 1957; Rhine & Severance, 1970). Resistance and persistence of an important attitude was thought to be determined by four factors: 1) link to psychological elements through a network of associations in memory (Ostrom & Brock, 1969; Pratkins & Greenwald, 1989), 2) accompanied by relevant knowledge in memory (Davidson, 1995; Wood, 1982), 3) congruence in attitude preference with important others (Heider, 1958) and 4) commitment to publicly supported attitudes (Krosnick, 1989).

Previous measures of attitude importance have relied upon individuals self-reports of how important an issue or object was to them personally (Boninger et al., 1995; Krosnick, 1988a, 1989; Krosnick et al., 1993) In the area of political attitudes, three types of questions were generally used: "asking people how important an attitude object is to them personally, how deeply they care about it, and how concerned they are about it" (Boninger et al., 1995; p. 62). Individual self-reports about the importance they placed upon a particular object or issue have been found to provide a clearer assessment of importance than self-reports of how important their attitudes were toward that object or issue (Krosnick & Petty, 1995).

Other investigators (Brickner, Harkins, Ostrom, 1986; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Petty, Cacioppo, Haugtvedt, 1992) have suggested that attitude importance may be assessed through manipulations of perceived importance (e.g. social identification) and
had participants list the number and favorableness of thoughts about an object or issue. Boninger et al., (1995) (study 2) assessed attitude importance through a series of five questions: "how important the issue was to them personally, how much they personally cared about the issue, how much the issue meant to them, and how important the issue was to them compared to other issues" (p. 66). Participants responded to each question on Likert-typed scales ranging from 1 (extremely important) to 4 (not too important). Participants were then instructed to record all thoughts, beliefs, feelings and ideas that contributed to why they considered an issue important when responding to each of the five questions. It was believed important attitudes would involve stronger affective reactions and be linked to other attitudes, beliefs and values in memory.

Manipulations of attitude importance have generally involved using personal relevance to induce changes in the importance of an individual's attitude. Personal relevance has been identified as "proximal cause" of attitude importance (Petty, Cacioppo & Haugtvedt, 1992) that stems from self-interest, social identification or value relevance (Boninger et al., 1995). Attitude importance has been manipulated by increasing participants' level of relevance or decreasing the level of relevance for some topic or object (Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994).

**Attitude Extremity**

Attitude extremity represents the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness in an individual's evaluation of an object. The more extreme (i.e. polarized) an attitude becomes, the further it deviates from neutrality (Abelson, 1995; Judd & Johnson, 1981; Tesser, 1978). The further away an attitude was from neutrality, the more extreme it was considered regardless of the direction (i.e. valence) (Abelson, 1995; Tesser, Martin, & Mendolia, 1995). Extreme attitudes have been found to be more resistant to change.
(Tannenbaum, 1966; Tesser et al., 1995) and likely to produce stronger contrast effects (Brent & Granberg, 1982).

The extremity of an attitude may result from the complexity of beliefs associated with the attitude. The less complex one's beliefs were about an object the more extreme that attitude was found regardless of direction (Linville & Jones, 1980). Attitude objects are evaluated more extremely (i.e. either unfavorable or favorable) when that attitude is accompanied with few beliefs about its attributes. Linville (1982) demonstrated that people's beliefs about out-groups are less complex than their beliefs related to in-groups which results in an extreme evaluation of out-group members.

Attitude extremity has typically been operationalized as the deviation on an individual's attitude from the mid-point of a pro-con dimension (Bassili, 1996; Krosnick et al., 1993). Attitude extremity can be derived from self-report measures on semantic differential scales and single-item rating instruments. For example, Bassili (1996) had participants report their attitudes toward laws against hate literature on a 10-point rating scale anchored at one end by "no feeling" and at the other end by "much feeling". Attitude extremity was calculated from the absolute value of the difference between the subject's answer and the mid-point of the scale (i.e. 5.5). In attitude change literature, experimental treatments are used to manipulate attitude extremity in attempts to move an attitude in one direction or the other from a neutral point. Experimental treatments have included repetition of exposure (Haugtvedt et al., 1994), expression of attitudes (Downing, Judd, & Brauer, 1992), strong arguments (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983), and mere thought (Tesser, Martin, & Mendolia, 1995) to produce a change in attitude extremity.

Attitude Intensity

Attitude intensity refers to type of affective reaction or strength of feeling that an individual has toward an attitude object. Some attitude objects create strong affective
reaction which in turn produce a strong emotional reaction in the individual while other attitude objects produce little to no emotional reaction (Krosnick & Schuman, 1988).

Attitude intensity has been defined as the strength of feeling for an attitude object (Krosnick & Schuman, 1988; Schuman & Presser, 1981) and has been used in many instances to mean attitude strength (Raden, 1985). Intense attitudes have been suggested to be more stable (Schuman & Presser, 1981) due to the implication that these attitudes have on ego-involvement. Measures of attitude intensity generally involved asking individuals how strong or intense their feelings were toward some attitude object (Krosnick et al., 1993; Schuman & Presser, 1981). These measurements have relied upon self-report responses to assess the intensity of feeling or emotion that the attitude object produces (Cantril, 1946).

**Attitude Certainty**

Attitude certainty refers to the confidence or conviction individuals have in their attitudes. Certainty represented the degree to which individuals were confident that their attitude towards an object was correct (Budd, 1986; Krosnick & Schuman, 1988). The more certainty placed in an attitude the more one believed the attitude to be correct (Gross, Holtz, & Miller, 1995) and resistant to change (Swann, Pelham, & Chidester, 1988). Attitude certainty has been suggested to strengthen attitude-behavior consistency (Fazio & Zanna, 1978a) by allowing individuals to have more confidence in their attitudes to make judgments about future events and guide behavior (Fazio & Zanna, 1978a).

**Attitude certainty has usually been assessed by through self-report measures.** Respondents were asked how sure they were in their opinion about an object, how easily their opinion could be changed, or how confident they were in their opinion (Budd, 1986; Holtz & Miller, 1985; Krosnick et al., 1993; Krosnick & Schuman, 1988). Manipulations of attitude certainty generally involved attempts to change the confidence individuals had
in their attitudes (Fazio & Zanna, 1978b) through exposure of either a counter or pro attitudinal messages.

**Knowledge**

Attitude knowledge refers to the amount of attitude-relevant knowledge that accompanies an attitude. The amount of stored information or stored knowledge that an individual had was found to moderate the attitude-behavior correspondence (Kallgren & Wood, 1986). Attitudes supported by greater amounts of knowledge should be more consistent with behavior than attitudes based upon little to no knowledge.

The level of attitude-relevant knowledge was found to influence resistance to change and attitude-behavior consistency (Davidson et al., 1985; Wood, 1982). Wood (1982) demonstrated that participants who were able to recall more behaviors and beliefs about the topic of environmental preservation were more resistant to counter attitudinal messages opposing preservation activities. In persuasion studies, prior knowledge has been suggested to bias the processing of incoming information when an individual has been given a counter attitudinal message (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b).

The more knowledge one has in their memory about an object, the more likely that person will draw upon this information to form and attitude. Attitudes based upon higher levels of knowledge were less likely to change than attitudes based upon little information (Wood, 1982) and more likely to predict behavior than attitudes without relevant knowledge (Davidson et al. 1985). Attitudes based upon previous knowledge have been suggested to be resistant due to greater cognitive resources available and the extensive linkages between the attitudes and other cognitive components (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

Individuals who possess large amounts of knowledge about an attitude object are more likely to evaluate an object consistently with previous beliefs. Tesser and Leone (1977) demonstrated that males evaluated football plays (i.e. tackles) differently than
females while women evaluated fashion articles differently that men. Men's attitudes toward fashion tended to be more polarized while women's attitudes toward football were more polarized.

The amount of attitude-relevant knowledge has generally been measured by asking participants to list everything they know and can remember about an object (Kallgren & Wood, 1986; Wood, 1982), the number of correct answers on a questionnaire (Wilson, Kraft & Dunn, 1989), and self-reports on how knowledgeable they feel about an object (Davidson et al., 1985; Kanwar, Grund, & Olson, 1990; Krosnick et al., 1993). Manipulations of knowledge typically have included providing participants with new information associated with an attitude object (Lewan & Stotland, 1961), more specific information about the object (McMichael, 1992 Unpublished) or direct contact and new experiences with an attitude object (Berger & Mitchell, 1989; Regan & Fazio, 1977)

**Personal Relevance**

Personal relevance refers to the level of involvement one has toward an attitude object. Involvement represents the level of perceived personal importance and interest created by an object (i.e. issue involvement). Personal relevance reflects the extent to which an attitude object has significant consequences for some aspect of an individual's life (Petty & Cacioppo, 1990). The level of a person's involvement can be examined on a continuum which ranges from lack of interest at one end to obsession at the other end. Personal relevance stemmed from theories of involvement (Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall 1965) which suggested that the level of involvement determined: how closely one will pay attention to information about an object, how interested one is in obtaining information about the object, how closely one pays attention to stories about the issue, and the importance of the information about the object. Some attitudes have been generally
considered to be more personally relevant than other attitudes (Petty, Cacioppo, Haugtvedt, 1992).

The relevance of an attitude was thought to occur from personal involvement, vested interest and importance (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Personal involvement reflected those attitudes that were deemed as relevant and produced involvement with an issue or object (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983; Thomsen, Borgida, Lavine, 1995). Vested interest represented the extent to which an attitude object was perceived to be instrumental to tangible outcomes (Crano, 1995). There are several broad types of involvement: product involvement, message-response involvement, and ego involvement (Richins, Bloch, & McQuarrie, 1992). Product involvement refers to the level of interest in a particular product. Message-response involvement represents the level of interest in processing marketing communications. Ego-involvement refers to the importance of an object to an individual's self-concept.

Personal relevance has been generally measured with self-report measures that assessed the level of interest and/or attention given to information about an object (Krosnick et al., 1993). Petty, Cacioppo and Goldman (1981) asked respondents to listen to a message advocating senior comprehensive exams which was to be put into effect the following academic school year. Respondents who were seniors interpreted the issue of senior exams as low in personal relevance (i.e. the implementation of the policy would not affect them) while other respondents deemed this issue as relevant since it would affect their graduation requirements (Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman, 1981).

Personal relevance has been manipulated by changing the likelihood that participants will be affected by an issue or object such as comprehensive exams instituted at a distant university or their own (Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994) or the year the exam will go in effect (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). Haugtvedt and Wegener (1994) had participants rate how personally relevant an object was on an 11-point scale anchored at
one end by [1] "not personally relevant" and will not affect me" to [11] "personally relevant" and "will affect me".

Attitude Accessibility

Attitude accessibility represents the temporal association between an attitude object and an evaluative response. Accessibility refers to the speed and ease through which an attitude was recalled from memory (Fazio, 1995). Attitudes that were activated more quickly have been suggested to be more powerful determinants of behavior (Zanna, Olson, & Fazio, 1981) because they were more likely to be accessible upon exposure to an object or relevant cue (Fazio, Chen, McDonel, & Sherman, 1982). Furthermore, attitudes that were freely chosen based upon behavior were more accessible from memory (Fazio, Herr, & Olney, 1984).

An accessible attitude typically has been considered strong because of the strength of the associative link between an attitude object and its evaluation. Fazio and Williams (1986) examined the speed of respondents answers to questions related to presidential candidates and the relationship between voting and attitudes in a presidential election. They found that participants whose evaluations of presidential candidates were reported faster tended to vote consistently with their attitudes toward that candidate. Respondents which answered the attitudinal questions quickly showed a stronger relation between their attitudes and their beliefs (Fazio & Williams, 1986).

Accessibility has been measured by the length of time it took for an individual to report their attitude toward an object on a computer (Fazio, 1986; Fazio & Williams 1986; Krosnick et al., 1993), over the phone (Bassili, 1996), or the likelihood that an individual would mention the object in a self-report response to an open-ended question (Krosnick 1988a). Accessibility represents the amount of time that had elapsed between the evaluation of the attitude object and when the attitude object was presented to participants.
Accessibility represents the speed of attitude retrieval in response to a question about that attitude. Manipulations of attitude accessibility have attempted to increase accessibility through repetition. Respondents have been asked to write their attitudes repeatedly (Powell & Fazio, 1984) or respond to identical attitudinal scales that have been formatted differently (Fazio et al., 1982).

Direct Experience

Direct experience refers to the degree to which one has participated in behavioral activities related to an object and the amount of direct contact one has had with the object. Direct experience has been found to increase the consistency between attitude and behavior (Davidson et al., 1985; Fazio & Zanna, 1981). Attitudes based upon direct experience were reported to have greater clarity and held with more confidence and certainty than attitudes not based upon direct experience (Fazio & Zanna, 1981). Attitudes formed via direct experience have been suggested to be more resistant by linking the attitude object to beliefs and prior experience (Wood, 1982), persistent (Watts, 1967) and predictive of behavior (Fazio et al., 1982). Attitudes based upon indirect experience were thought to be poor predictors of behavior because they are easily changed (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

Attitudes formed from direct experience have yielded higher correlations with behavior than attitudes formed through indirect experience (Doll & Ajzen, 1992; Fazio & Zanna, 1978a; Regan & Fazio, 1977). Attitudes based upon direct experience have greater impact on the attitude-behavior relationship because these attitudes have more clarity, confidence, certainty and convey more information than attitudes based upon indirect experience (Fazio & Zanna, 1981).

Direct experience has been assessed with self-report measures of behavioral experience. Respondents were asked how involved they were in activities related to an
object (Krosnick et al., 1993), if they have committed any actions in regards to an object (Regan & Fazio, 1977; Schuman & Presser, 1981). Other self-reports measures have provided respondents with an opportunity to perform an activity (i.e. playing a game, signing a petition, joining a subject pool) (Fazio & Zanna, 1978a; Regan & Fazio, 1977).

**Latitude of Rejection**

The latitude of rejection refers to the level at which some attitudes are contrasted or assimilated from some anchor or reference point (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Individuals were assumed to experience tension and discomfort when they encounter information about a topic that opposes their attitudes (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Attitudes were thought to serve as an anchor for opinions toward an object and used to make certain judgments about their attitudes or statements expressed by others (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Social Judgment Theory (Sherif & Hoveland, 1953; Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1965; Sherif & Sherif, 1967) proposed that individuals arranged stimuli along an attitudinal continua in some meaningful order based upon two judgmental distortions: contrast and assimilation.

Contrast referred to a shift in judgment away from an anchor or reference point while assimilation represented a shift toward some anchor or reference point (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). When confronted with a statement about which ones hold a previous attitude, an individual will assimilate that statement (i.e. perceive it to be closer to his or her own attitude). When the statement was perceived as different or discrepant the individual will contrast the statement (i.e. perceive it as being further from their own attitude) (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).

Social Judgment Theory identified three categories within an attitude dimension: latitude of acceptance, latitude of rejection and latitude of non-commitment (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). The latitude of acceptance represented an individuals position or attitude
about an object which included any opinions they perceived as acceptable. The latitude of rejection consisted of any statements or attitudes toward an object which were objectionable. The latitude of non-commitment represented those statements that were neither acceptable nor objectionable.

Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergall (1965) suggested that an individual's latitudes were related to ego-involvement. Ego-involvement has been assumed to strengthen how previous attitudes are anchored which affects the relative size of the latitude or rejection (Hoveland, Harvey, & Sherif, 1957). Higher levels of ego-involvement have been found to increase the level of assimilation and contrast which in turn produced more resistant attitudes (Sherif, Kelly, Rodgers, Sarup, & Tittler, 1973) and consistency between attitudes and behavior (Fazio & Zanna, 1978a). Individuals who have highly involved attitudes are more likely to reject a wider range of statements that are discrepant from their own attitudinal position than individuals who possess less involved attitudes (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). In a persuasion context, higher levels of ego-involvement have increased resistance to counter attitudinal messages and increase assimilation of pro attitudinal messages (Eagly, 1967).

Latitude of rejection measures have presented respondents with a list of attitude statements about an object that represents a range of positions. One method asks respondents to sort a large number of attitude statements about an object into piles or categories that were similar (Sherif & Hoveland, 1953). Highly involved respondents will create fewer categories statements than less involved individuals (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Latitude of rejection has also been measured with an ordered set of statements that ranged across an attitude dimension from extremely unfavorable to extremely favorable toward an object (Hoveland, Harvey, & Sherif, 1957; Krosnick et al., 1993). Respondents were asked to pick those statements that were most objectionable. Highly involved
respondents reported more objectionable statements than less involved individuals (Krosnick et al., 1993).

**Affective-Cognitive Consistency**

Affective-cognitive consistency represents the level of correspondence between an individual's evaluation of their attitude toward an object and his or her beliefs about the attributes of the attitude object (Rosenberg, 1956). This consistency reflects the extent to which the evaluative implications of one's beliefs about an attitude object were consistent with one's overall evaluation of it (Rosenberg, 1968b). Strong attitudes have been found to possess a high degree of structural consistency between feelings and beliefs (Rosenberg, 1956, 1968b). In contrast, weak attitudes reflect an inconsistency between feelings and beliefs (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

Individuals who reported inconsistencies held beliefs that were discrepant from their attitudes or lacked any beliefs about the attitude object (Rosenberg, 1968b). Higher consistency between feelings and beliefs toward an attitude object has been associated with higher levels of attitude stability and resistance (Rosenberg, 1968b) greater resistance to persuasive appeals (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993), and higher attitude-behavior relationships (Norman, 1975). Stronger attitudes reflect a consistency between affective orientations toward an object and the cognition's related to how the object was associated with the attainment of various goals and values (Rosenberg, 1968b).

The affective-cognitive consistency dimension was renamed in the 1980's as researchers began to distinguish between affect and evaluation. The new term "Evaluative-Cognitive Consistency" represented the consistency between a person's abstract evaluation of an attitude object and the evaluative content of his or her belief about an object (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). This new cognitive perspective proposed that person's who held beliefs that were inconsistent with feelings tended to organize these
beliefs in a different manner than those beliefs that are consistent. Chaiken and Baldwin (1981) examined the interrelations among beliefs for individuals who expressed high and low consistency for their beliefs and attitudes. Individuals who had higher levels of consistency were found to possess higher interrelations among all their beliefs about an attitude object. Chaiken and Yates (1985) found that when the degree of consistency between attitudes and beliefs was relatively high, these participants tended to generate thoughts that could be used to refute or discredit inconsistent information.

Affective-cognitive consistency has been assessed through both an affective measurement and a cognitive measurement. Both measurements are then standardized and compared to create an overall index (Chaiken, Pomerantz, & Giner-Sorolla, 1995; Crites, Fabrigar, & Petty, 1994). The affective component has generally assessed the extent to which an attitude object creates certain affective states while the cognitive component assessed the extent to which an attitude object possesses attributes that the person perceives as favorable or unfavorable (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

Crites, Fabrigar and Petty (1994) developed an affective component through the assessment of participants' feelings associated with various attitude objects (i.e. snakes, capital punishment) with a set of semantic differential scales anchored by general emotions toward these objects (i.e. angry vs. relaxed). A cognitive component was developed from respondents completion of a second set of semantic differential scales that measured general thoughts toward the attributes of the same objects (i.e. snakes, capital punishment) anchored by items such as "useful" vs. "useless." An overall affective-cognitive index was computed by standardizing both affective and cognitive scales and then comparing the difference between absolute scores on both scales.
Relations Between Attitude Properties

At first glance, it would seem that many of these attitude properties would be highly correlated with one another. A strong attitude would likely be extremely favorable or unfavorable, intensely held, based upon direct experience, bolstered by extensive knowledge, personally relevant and important, held with great certainty, etc. One would not expect to find a highly accessible attitude that was not personally relevant or supported by small amounts of knowledge and little direct experience. A personally important attitude would not likely be accompanied by moderate levels of extremity and intensity.

In contrast, a weak attitude would likely be: moderate to low in intensity and extremity, based upon little to no previous knowledge, little prior direct experience, personally unimportant or relevant, etc. Therefore, it would seem that the various attitude properties would tend to correspond or overlap with one another to represent a single underlying dimension. However, studies have demonstrated low to moderate positive correlations existed among various attitude properties (Bassili, 1996; Krosnick et al., 1993; cf. Krosnick & Abelson, 1992; Raden, 1985).

One plausible explanation for the low to moderate correlations observed might come from correlated measurement error. Zero order correlations may become distorted by random and systematic measurement error and result in correlations between attitude dimensions to be overestimated or underestimated (Krosnick et al., 1993). When different methods were employed to examine dimensions, correlations could be reduced while identical measurement methods could inflate correlations. Cote and Bucycky (1987) provided evidence that random and systematic error may account for over 50% of the variance in psychological measures. In attempts to solve random measurement error, some researchers turned to multiple measures of the dimensions (Bassili, 1996; Krosnick et al., 1993) or a multiple indicator multitrait-multimethod analysis (Krosnick et al., 1993).
Krosnick et al. (1993) noted estimates of correlations between attitude properties had created disagreement among social psychologist as to the structural relations among these properties and whether they reflected one underlying construct. Krosnick et al. (1993) collected multiple measures of ten dimensions of attitude strength that had received considerable theoretical and empirical attention: extremity, intensity, certainty, importance, interest in relevant information, knowledge, accessibility, direct experience, latitude of rejection and non-commitment and affective-cognitive consistency. Three studies were conducted with structural equation modeling to determine the relationship among these dimensions and to examine if there was a single underlying construct. LISREL VII (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1989) was used to conduct a multitrait-multimethod confirmatory factor analysis of the observed correlation matrix. Structural equation modeling was applied to correct for the impact of random and systematic measurement error for ten attitude dimensions (Krosnick et al., 1993).

The results from Krosnick et al. (1993), revealed that although some dimensions were strongly correlated (i.e. thinking-perceived knowledge: \( r = .78 \)), most of the correlations were moderate to weak. These results lead these researchers to suggest that a, "single-factor model could not account for the covariation among these dimension" (p. 1142). Their findings suggested that attitude properties although highly related at times, should be conceptualized as distinct constructs of attitude strength.

Other researchers have presented evidence that attitude dimensions reflected a few higher order constructs (Abelson, 1988; Lastovicka & Gardner, 1979; Verplanken, 1991). However, these studies have come under criticism for their use of data reductions techniques (i.e. exploratory factor analysis) and uncontrolled random and systematic measurement error (Krosnick et al., 1993). For example, Abelson (1988) conducted an exploratory factor analysis and proposed that under special conditions, attitude properties
may represent three general dimensions: cognitive elaboration, emotional commitment, and ego-preoccupation.

Krosnick and Petty (1995) voiced a similar opinion suggesting that,

"evidence suggests that the one factor view of strength-related attributes may not be viable... and difficult to reduce the set of dimensions to a smaller set of latent construct and doing so may be counterproductive." (p.17-18)

Taken together, this body of research has demonstrated that various attitude properties are distinct and have important consequences for the consistency between attitudes and behavior. These attitude properties and their strength related consequences provide the framework to identify those factors which account for strong, stable and continuous attachment to an athletic team.

**Integrated Loyalty Perspective**

Based upon the work of previous scholars, loyalty can be divided into a behavioral and attitudinal component (Backman & Crompton, 1991b; Crosby & Taylor, 1983; Day, 1969; Engel, Kotler & Blackwell, 1968; Jacoby, 1971; Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978; Jacoby & Kyner, 1973; Olson & Jacoby, 1971; Pritchard, 1991). Drawing upon attitude strength literature (Boninger et al., 1995; Krosnick & Abelson, 1992; Krosnick et al., 1993; Krosnick & Petty, 1995), the attitudinal component may be further divided into two dimensions or components related to various attitude properties. Hence, a composite measure could be developed to integrate durability and impactful dimensions into one index that would provide a fuller understanding of the attitudinal component of loyalty and its relationship to behavior.

The idea of a composite measure to operationalize brand loyalty was first suggested by Jacoby and Chestnut (1978). The composite measure attempted to integrate the behavioral and attitudinal component into a single index. This composite approach combines the behavioral and attitudinal data into a composite measure of brand loyalty.
Jacoby and Chestnut (1978) suggested that the composite measure represented a valid and reliable method to differentiate between repeat purchase behavior and brand loyalty.

The operationalization of the attitudinal component of loyalty in terms of various attitude properties provides a means to understand the influence that attitudes have on information processing and judgment as well as their impact on behavior. This approach conceptually partitions the attitudinal component into two distinct yet related dimensions: attitudinal durability and attitudinal impact. The attitudinal durability dimension would reflect those attitude properties that are related to persistence and resistance while the attitudinal impact dimension would reflect those attitudinal properties that are related to cognitive and behavioral responses.

These attitude properties may combine with one another additively or multiplicatively to yield an overall index that represents attitudinal loyalty (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995). The partitioning of the attitudinal component of team loyalty into two independently related dimensions of durability and impactfulness conceptually elaborates upon the previous operational definition of the attitudinal component of loyalty. This partitioning should provide a means to understand loyalty in terms of a composite measurement of attitude strength in terms of the structural relations among various attitude properties and their related consequences. Previous measures of team loyalty could be integrated with this new attitudinal perspective to investigate those factors that contribute to differences in team loyalty.

Team Loyalty

The integration of attitude strength research to examine loyalty provides a more robust investigation of how attitudes impact behavior and subsequently team loyalty. Loyalty should reflect attitudes which are buttressed by strong relations among properties high levels on each property and correlated to behavior (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995).
These attitudinal properties would impact loyalty via durability features (i.e. persistence and resistance) and impactful features (i.e. influence cognition and behavior). The interpretation loyalty in terms of the conative, affective and cognitive antecedents and consequences of attitude strength, enables the partitioning of loyalty into durability and impactful components (e.g. Day, 1969). Therefore, team loyalty would be defined in a manner similar to brand loyalty with attitude strength providing the link between the behavioral and attitudinal components.

Team loyalty as defined in the present study represents the correspondence between an individual's willingness to demonstrate loyal behavior and their attitudes that reflect high structural support from various attitude properties. This definition would consist of a behavioral component and an attitudinal component (e.g. Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978). The behavioral component would include a fan's repeat behavior in regards to a particular team such as watching/attending a sporting event, purchasing related apparel, ruminating over past games, seeking out relevant information, etc. The attitudinal component would represent the extent to which a fan's attitude possesses a high degree of extremity, intensity, certainty, importance, relevance, knowledge, accessibility, direct experience, latitude of rejection and affective-cognitive consistency (e.g. Krosnick et al., 1993). This attitude should have durability and impactful consequences that influence the individual to: a) remain a fan of the same team over a period of time, b) not change his or her affiliation with the team, c) think about certain information and render decision concerning the team and d) engage in future behavior towards a team.
Behavioral Dimension

Previous studies cited in the sport literature have relied primarily upon game attendance figures to measure an individual's behavior in regards to an athletic team (Baade & Tiehan, 1990; Becker & Sul, 1983; Hansen & Gauthier, 1989; Noll, 1974). These studies utilized game attendance figures to examine a number of factors (i.e. team performance, population, competition, etc.) hypothesized to influence attendance. The limitations of these studies were that attendance figures were primarily used to predict future attendance and not fan support of a team. Even if attendance figures were used to assess team support, the behavioral dimension related to team loyalty has some unique characteristics that were not addressed in these studies.

Reliance upon attendance figures or television viewership rates as behavioral measures to assess team support do not adequately reflect fan loyalty (e.g. Pritchard et al., 1992). An individual may be prevented from exhibiting loyal behavior to a team or forced to demonstrate loyal behavior to other teams due to certain restrictions. A loyal fan may not attend a game which features his or her favorite team due monetary constraints, ticket availability, work responsibilities, etc. (e.g. Backman & Crompton, 1991b). This fan would be considered disloyal in previous studies.

However, in other situations, a loyal fan may watch a game on television which features two random sport teams. This behavior would be construed as loyalty to one of the featured teams, however, the fan may not be loyal to either featured team. The individual may have been prevented from watching his or her favorite team due to geographic location and lack of television coverage. Thus, the fan would be considered as not exhibiting loyal behavior but in reality would still remain loyal to his or her favorite team (e.g. Backman & Crompton, 1991b).
The unique considerations related to fan loyalty imply that game attendance measure of loyalty alone are inadequate. Game attendance does not account for the constraints that may prohibit a fan from demonstration of loyal behavior or lead to unloyal behavior. Reliance upon attendance figures of fans do not adequately capture team support (e.g. Murrell & Dietz, 1992). A more appropriate behavioral measure would be to use a percentage of behavioral opportunities. Mahony (1995, Unpublished) suggested that, "The percent of behavioral opportunities available to an individual that he/she takes advantage of may be the best was to assess behavioral loyalty" (p. 19).

Although the behavioral component of team loyalty should include attendance or viewership figures, by themselves these measurements were insufficient to assess team support. There exist numerous factors that affect attendance but may be unrelated to loyalty (e.g. Hansen & Gauthier, 1989). Behavioral measures of team loyalty must consider a fan's ability to demonstrate loyalty toward an athletic team independent of uncontrollable behavioral aspects (i.e. television coverage, location of team, ticket availability, price of ticket, league standings, etc.). One perspectives from which to develop behavioral measures of fan loyalty comes from research in social psychology.

This perspective examines individual characteristics as well as situational factors that may influence and contribute to observed behavioral differences. Although the objective of this line of research did not attempt to measure team loyalty, results can be incorporated into the assessment of behavioral manifestations of team loyalty. Of particular importance is the work conducted by Cialdini, Borden, Thorne, Walker, Freeman, and Sloan (1976).

Cialdini et al., (1976) found that an association between an individual and a successful sports team increased that individual's self-esteem. This association was labeled "BIRGing" (i.e. basking in reflected glory) and proposed that a fan will bask in the reflected glory of his or her favorite (e.g. vicarious) sports team. Cialdini et al.,'s (1976)
BIRGing phenomenon was based upon Heider's (1946, 1958) Balance Theory. Heider's (1958) work dealt with the operation of consistency in terms of the balancing of dyads (two elements) and triads (three elements). Heider emphasized an individual's perception of the internal consistency of the relationship between these elements.

Balance was thought to occur when all of the elements appear to be internally consistent and people were assumed to prefer balanced relations among elements as opposed to imbalanced relations. Heider (1958) proposed that individuals desired to be associated with successful others because an association with a positive other was perceived as internally consistent and tended to make that individual appear more positive. Balance Theory proposed that an individual would perceive another person as positive if that person was associated with a positive object. In contrast, if the relationship between a person and an object was perceived as negative, then that person was viewed as negative.

Cialdini et al., (1976) utilized Balance Theory to investigate an individual's reported association with a university sports team in a series of three experiments. The first experiment examined the rate to which university related apparel was worn on a Monday after a football team's win versus a loss on the campuses of seven universities in the United States. They observed that a higher percentage of students wore apparel (i.e. sweat shirts and T-shirts) and buttons on a Monday after a win as opposed to a loss. These results suggested that by donning school related apparel, an individual engaged in a vicarious-relational style in which a person attempts and prefers to be identified with a successful team. This association enabled an individual to satisfy his or her need for achievement and self-esteem by sharing in the success of another (Cialdini et al., 1976).

In experiment two, Cialdini et al., (1976) observed that students at one university were more likely to BIRG when they were put in a personally failing situation. Students responded to an information survey and were told that either they did well (success
condition) or poorly (failure condition). Students were then asked to describe a previous game in which their university football team won. Individuals in the failure condition whom suffered a loss of prestige, used the pronoun "we" more often to describe the previous game than did students in the success conditions.

The results from Cialdini et al.'s (1976) study of the BIRGing phenomenon suggested that individuals would be more likely to increase their association with a team when the team had been successful. An individual's tendency to publicize their connection with a successful other was determined by a desire to enhance self-esteem. The tendency to engage in BIRGing behavior was observed more often when an individual suffered a loss of public self-esteem.

Furthermore, Cialdini et al.'s (1976) experiments supported the notion of Schafer (1969) who proposed that a fan's identify with a team because that team comes to signify and extension of their personal self. Zyto-Sitkiewcz (1991) reported similar findings in which being a fan satisfied an individual's need for social approval. Although the goal of Cialdini et al. (1976) research was not to measure fan loyalty, their findings provide a means to measure the behavior of loyal fans.

Loyal fans of a team would be expected to wear only sport related paraphernalia from their favorite team and would avoid paraphernalia from other teams. A loyal fan would demonstrate this behavior regardless of team performance. Fans who exhibit loyal behavior would be expected to use the pronoun "we" more often regardless of performance outcomes when referencing their favorite team. In contrast, disloyal fans would utilize the pronoun "they" more often to describe a losing performance of a team. Disloyal fans would be expected to wear sport related paraphernalia and use the pronoun "we" only when a team was successful in attempts to publicize their association with the team. However, when the team lost, the disloyal fan would refrain from exhibiting loyal behavior.
The development of behavioral measures of loyalty must include assessments of loyal behavior as well as non loyal behavior. Jacoby and Chestnut (1978) proposed utilizing a philosophy of science perspective to study brand loyalty in that, "attempts to study and understand a given phenomenon are generally enhanced if one also studies the opposite or negative case" (p. 42). The implication of this perspective suggests that behavioral indice to measure disloyalty need to be developed to fully understand team loyalty.

One area from which to understand measures of disloyal behavior comes from the work of Snyder, Lassergard, and Ford (1986). Drawing upon Cialdini et al.,'s (1976) research, Snyder et al., (1986) proposed that fans will distance themselves from teams thereby demonstrating disloyal behavior when a team was unsuccessful. Hieder's (1958) Balance Theory suggested that individuals attempt to increase the distance between themselves and unsuccessful others to avoid a negative perception by others. Snyder et al., (1986) proposed that a "CORFing" "cutting off reflected failure" phenomenon occurred when a team lost. CORFing operated as a ego protective device that allowed an individual to distance oneself from an unsuccessful object, thus, cutting off any perceived negative association.

Snyder et al., (1986) examined this CORFing phenomenon by measuring an individual's identification and feelings concerning his or her membership within a group. Results revealed that individuals demonstrated a greater desire to be associated with a successful group but little desire to maintain their association with an unsuccessful group. These results suggested that fans would attempt to increase a perceived association with a team when it was successful but would desire to decrease a perceived association when the team was unsuccessful.

Sole reliance upon behavioral measures that only examine loyal behavior (i.e. BIRGing) would not adequately capture whether or not a fan was truly loyal to a team.
The incorporation of measures that assessed an individual's tendency to engage in disloyal behavior as well as loyal behavior would provided a comprehensive understanding of fan loyalty. Individuals who demonstrated loyal behavior (i.e. BIRGing) would only be considered truly loyal if they do not demonstrate disloyal behavior (i.e. CORFing). A loyal fan demonstrating behavior such as wearing team paraphernalia could be differentiated from a disloyal fan by their tendency to engage in disloyal behavior such as not donning team related apparel after a team's loss.

Taken together, this body of research suggested that assessment of the behavioral component of team loyalty should involve the development of indices to measure loyal as well as disloyal behavior. While these behavioral measures could provide an indication of who a team's loyal fans were, they provide limited information as to what accounts for a fan to maintain a strong, stable and continuous attachment to an athletic team. Behavioral indices alone are inadequate to understand the complexity of fan behavior. These measures failed to account for the underlying factors that contributed to the behaviors observed. To understand the factors that contributed to behavioral differences among fans, researchers turned to development of attitudinal measures to examine the attitudinal component of team loyalty.

Attitudinal Dimension

Since the 1970's, the study of loyalty had focused primarily upon the refinement of behavioral and attitudinal measures. Although the behavioral dimension of team loyalty had been established and was relatively easy to measure, the attitudinal component had been largely ignored and remained underdeveloped (Pritchard, 1992). At present, only two studies have examined the attitudinal component of team loyalty. Murrell and Dietz (1992) were the first researchers that examined the attitudinal component of team loyalty through the impact of fan identification on team support. Mahony (1995, Unpublished)
examined the effect of self-monitoring on an individual's psychological commitment to a team and whether differences in self-monitoring were related to team performance.

Murrell and Dietz (1992) equated game attendance to team support and examined whether or not an individual's identification with a sport team would operate similar to group identification. These researchers utilized Crocker and Luhtanen's (1990) Collective Self-Esteem scale and Linville, Fischer and Salovey's (1986) Group Identification scale to measure group identification. Murrell and Dietz (1992) demonstrated that high levels of self-esteem and group identification were positively correlated with higher levels of team support. The extent to which an individual desired to be a member of a group (i.e. group of fans) reflected a concern for one's self-concept. This self-concept represented an "identity esteem" and was found to be important for both attitudinal and behavioral support for a sports team independent of team record. There results suggested that group identification as measured by collective self-esteem and group differentiation could be used to predict attitudinal support of a team regardless of attendance.

Murrell and Dietz (1992) were the first to demonstrate that attitudinal support for a team may be strong regardless of actual fan attendance. This reconfirms the notion that attendance measures by themselves do not adequately assess team loyalty because factors that affect attendance may be unrelated to loyalty (i.e. team location, ticket availability, broadcasting of games, etc.). Although these researchers were the first to examine the attitudinal component of team loyalty from a theoretical base, there are some methodological problems in their assessment of the attitudinal dimension constrain their results.

Murrell and Dietz (1992) operationalized the attitudinal component of team support with three measures. Attitudinal support was measured by averaging participants' responses on three questions: "a) How much do you like this team, b) how good do you think that this team is, and c) how good do you think this team is compared to other
teams?" (p. 32). Although the reliabilities reported for these items were high (.92 and .91), there are some content validity issues with their questions.

There were two items that were more reflective of questions directed at measuring team quality than assessment of a fan's support of a team. An individual may think a particular team was good and/or better than other teams but still not support this team. A loyal fan of the Dallas Cowboys may think that the San Francisco 49er's were a good football team and better than a majority of the other National Football Leagues teams but is still not a loyal fan of the 49er's. Murrell and Dietz's (1992) attitudinal measures of fan support were suspect and should be viewed with caution.

Mahony (1995, Unpublished) suggested previous research in sport lacked any reliable and valid measurements of the attitudinal component of team loyalty. Mahony drew from leisure industry literature to develop an acceptable attitudinal scale. Although a sizable amount of literature existed on the construct of brand loyalty, its application to a sports context has only recently been utilized. In the area of leisure sports, the concept of brand loyalty has been utilized to examine recreation participant's loyalty to specific recreational activities (Backman & Crompton, 1991a, 199b; Howard et al., 1988; Pritchard, 1992; Pritchard, Howard, Havitz, 1992; Selin et al., 1988).

Pritchard (1992) operationalized the attitudinal component of loyalty in terms of psychological commitment which included components of resistance, cognitive consistency, position involvement, confidence, cognitive complexity, and volition. Pritchard et al., (1992) operationalized attitudinal loyalty to leisure goods and services in terms of cognitive consistency and resistance to change. Psychological commitment represented an, "individuals tendency to resist change in preference in response to conflicting information or experience" (Crosby & Taylor, 1983: p. 414).

Mahony (1995, Unpublished) integrated literature on resistance (e.g. Crosby & Taylor, 1983; Pritchard, 1992; Pritchard et al., 1992) with attitude strength research on
attitude resistance (e.g. Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994). Mahony hypothesized resistance to change was the general underlying factor which contributed to team commitment. Mahony developed the Psychological Commitment to Team scale (PCT) to measure the resistance of a fan to change his or her commitment toward a favorite professional football team. Items were adapted from Pritchard's (1992) scale into a sports context. These items emphasized the importance of resistance to assess the attitudinal dimension of team loyalty.

Mahony's (1995, Unpublished) PCT scale addressed one key deficiency in fan loyalty through an examination of the attitudinal component from a theoretical base. However, the PCT has some conceptual and operational limitations that constrain its explanatory power. Examination of the attitudinal component of team loyalty must incorporate theoretical frames from attitude strength research. The attitudinal component of fan loyalty in essence reflects the extent to which a fan possesses attitudes that are durable and impactful and supported by various attitude properties.

Mahony's (1995, Unpublished) conceptualization of resistance to change as the most critical feature of the attitudinal component of team loyalty was theoretically constrained. Resistance to change has not been shown to be any more important than any of the other three features of attitude strength. Although Eagly and Chaiken (1995) have recently suggested that resistance may cause the other three features, to date their exist no conclusive evidence to support the resistance proposition. Mahony's assumption that resistance was more critical to attitude strength than persistence and impactful features needs further empirical support. Furthermore, Mahony's measurement of commitment did not provide any explanation as to what factors contributed to an attitude's resilient quality.
Factors Affecting Team Loyalty

With so much time, energy and resources invested into maintaining interest and involvement in sport, it was important to understand the social psychological reasons why fans may become loyal to teams. This investigation required an examination of what needs were satisfied through fan loyalty. Some researchers have utilized theoretical frameworks from social psychology to investigate what motivates and sustains team loyalty.

Cialdini et al., (1976) demonstrated that BIRGing accounted for an individuals tendency to publicize their association with a successful other in order to enhance self-esteem. When a team wins, a fan should experience an increased level of self-esteem. Tajfel and Turner (1979) proposed that self-categorization invoked a self-evaluative social comparison that can be used to internalize the self in social situations. This self-evaluation reflected an individuals desire for positive self-esteem and was generated by in-group and out-group comparisons. Team loyalty reflects a social-psychological phenomenon functional for both individuals and groups. Group members form social identities based upon self-categorization which create affective attachment to the and group from feeling, concern and devotion to its well-being. In attempts to understand the impact and consequences of fan loyalty, Wann & Branscombe incorporated social identity theory to explain aspects of fan behavior.

Social Identity Theory implies that fans may be attracted to sports teams in order to develop a social identity and their self-esteem needs are tied to that group identity. Social Identity Theory emerged from the work of Henri Tajfel and reflects an individuals desire to become a member of a certain social group. Tajfel (1982) defined social identity as "the part of the individual's self-concept which derives from their knowledge of their membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (p. 2). The value placed upon membership within a group of fans may help explain self-esteem benefits a fan derives from association.
with a particular athletic team and the psychological process linked to this phenomenon. Tajfel and Turner (1979) conceptualized a group as:

"a collection of individuals who perceive themselves to be members of the same social category, share some emotional involvement in this common definition of themselves, and achieve some degree of social consensus about the evaluation of their group and their membership of it" (p. 40)

Turner and Giles (1981) noted that most games which involved teams were examples of pure inter-group behavior. For fans a large part of their attraction to team sports were to, "identity with one's own team or the representatives of one's own institution, area or country, empathize with their struggles and share vicariously in the emotions of victory or defeat" (p. 2). Identification with a sports team enables an individual to define an identity for oneself as well as others. When an individual identifies with a team, he or she can develop a sense of personal and collective esteem within a group.

Social Identity Theory proposed that an individual attempts to maintain or enhance his or her personal and collective identity through identification with a social group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Personal and collective identities represent components of the self-concept and cognitive representations of the self. Personal identity reflects self-categorization based upon intrapersonal similarities and interpersonal differences that define the person in terms of self-descriptions of personal attributes such as personality, physical and intellectual traits (Brown & Turner, 1981; Turner & Oakes, 1989). Personal identity are those aspects of one's self-concept that are private and belong uniquely to the individual. Collective identity represents social categorization of the self (i.e. into in-group and out-group categories) based upon social similarities and differences between members of certain social categories such as race, class, sex, nationality, etc. (Brown & Turner, 1981; Turner & Oakes, 1989).
Fans would identify with sports teams because the group of fans to which they belong and identify with would influence their attitudes and alter their actions (e.g. Austin & Worcel, 1979). This identification would provide a link between one's self-concept and group membership. Self-Esteem would be affected not only by an individual(s)'s behavior, but also by the fortunes and misfortunes of the team in which they are affiliated with (e.g. Brewer, 1991; Kowalski & Wolfe, 1994). A fan values an association with a team and perceives this association as positive. The fan also perceives others in his or her social group as viewing the team as positive. Social groups provide members with a means to identify themselves in social terms. Aspects of the individual's self-image are often derived from the social categories to which he or she perceives as belonging (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Taken together, Social Identity theory and results of Cialdini et al., (1976) suggest that one possible antecedent of team loyalty would be an individual's desire to identify themselves with successful sports team. Identification reflects an in-group membership that enables individuals to develop and maintain self-esteem through fan behavior within the in-group context (Murrell & Dietz, 1992). Although fans may identify and associate with a successful team in order to enhance personal and collective self-esteem, what happens when this team is not successful.

Hirt, Zillman, Erickson and Kennedy (1992) examined the consequences of association with sports teams. Fans enter into associations with teams without the ability to control for performance outcomes. Hirt et al., (1992) suggested that "fanship" holds some unavoidable consequences for individuals. These authors demonstrated that fans received positive benefits from an association with a team such as enhanced mood and self-esteem when that team was successful. However, fans also incurred negative cost such as decreased mood and self-esteem when the team was unsuccessful. A strong identity with a team was integral to the fan's sense of self and often he or she responded to
a team's performance as if it directly affected oneself (Hirt et al., 1992). Tesser, Millar and Moore (1988) proposed that,

"Persons behave in a manner that will maintain or increase self-evaluation and ... one's relationship with others have a substantial impact on self-evaluation ... the better the other's performance and the closer the psychological relationship, the more one gain in self-evaluation through the reflection process." (p. 49).

Success of a team allowed fans to assess their own abilities as positive. However, when the team lost, this resulted in lower estimates of a fan's own ability (Hirt et al., 1992).

The results from Hirt et al.'s (1992) study implied that fans have the ability to invoke strategies that allow them to cope with uncontrollable performance outcomes. An individual's "total social identity" would be comprised of specific social identifications that could be made more salient depending upon the situation. An individual could "switch on" and make salient self-conceptions that could be useful to construe social stimuli in order to regulate behavior in an adaptive manner (Brown & Turner, 1981).

The implication of Social Identity for fan loyalty is that fans may voluntarily choose to become associated with a team in order to develop a social identity with the knowledge that this identity has benefits and cost associated with it. This chosen identity results in an individual activating and arranging different identities based upon personal needs and situational influences (Deaux, 1993). When an individual's personal identity was threatened, that individual affirmed other components of his or her identity which have not been threatened (Steele, 1988). Social identities have been found to expand and contract based upon self-serving interest (Brewer, 1991). If self-esteem is the driving mechanism behind a fan's attraction and affiliation with a sports team (e.g. Hirt et al., 1992), then fans will utilize coping strategies that can expand or contract their connection with a team to enhance, maintain or protect their self-esteem.

Snyder et al. (1986) suggested that CORFing operated as an ego protective device which enabled fans to protect and maintain self-esteem in the event of losses by their
favorite team. The results from Snyder et al., (1986) and Cialdini et al., (1976) indicated that a fan will choose to engage in BIRGing behavior when his or her team was successful and would engage in CORFing behavior when the team was unsuccessful. BIRGing represented a self-esteem enhancement strategy while CORFing an image protection strategy. These two strategies were particularly relevant for "fair weather" fans in order to enhance and protect self-esteem. However, they were not effective in accounting for why fans remained identified and attached to a team when it lost as indicative of behavior demonstrated by loyal sports fans.

Sports fans have often been characterized as loyal and true to their team even when that team loses. The notion of the die hard fan has been popularized in the media. The die hard fan has been characterized as maintaining their allegiance to a team through adversity. The Chicago Cubs Die-Hard Fan Club represents an example of individuals who are proud of their allegiance to the team even if that team has not won a world series since 1908 and is a perennial loser (Wann & Branscombe, 1990). Explanations are needed to understand what motivates the die hard fan to maintain allegiance to a team regardless of team performance.

One explanations for this die hard behavior can be found in Cialdini and Richardson's (1980) examination of the "BLASTing" phenomenon. Cialdini and Richardson (1980) examined why a fan would not engage in CORFing behavior in response to a loss by their favorite team. BLASTing represented a type of out-group degradation behavior that focused hostile actions and thoughts toward opposing fans, players and teams. Social Identity theory proposed that there exist two groups; an in-group and an out-group (Hogg & Abrams, 1988). In-group membership was highly valued and of critical importance to these individuals. In-group favoritism represented, "a tendency to favor in-group over out-group members on perceptual, attitudinal or behavioral dimension" (Turner, 1981; p. 66). The in-group protects member's self-esteem
by distinguishing between the differences of the in-group and out-group. This process often leads to stereotypes and categorizations of individuals by their membership within a group.

BLASTing indicated that individuals who might suffer a loss of self-esteem would engage in a strategy which allowed for the restoration or protection of their self-esteem. Die hard fans are highly allegiance fans who choose not to distance themselves from a team even in the event of a loss. If these fans choose to distance themselves from a losing team, they would remove themselves from in-group status. This would eliminate an identity which has emotional and value significance. Kasarawa (1991) demonstrated that individuals high in collective identity found it hard to dissociate themselves from a group because their identity was tied to group membership. Die hard fans maintained their allegiance to a team and deflected a potential loss of self-esteem by differentiating themselves from out-group members (e.g. opposing fans). Often this involves acts of aggression either verbally or physically toward opposing players and teams. Die hard fans can even BLAST their own team to restore and maintain their own self-esteem.

BLASTing explained why individuals in low status groups were expected to maintain their loyalty to the group (i.e. Cub's fans). Loyalty represents a sufficiently strong subjective bond of attachment between a fan and a sports team, that accounts for why people would continue to define themselves in terms of such membership even under conditions of negative social identity. Turner, Hogg, Oakes and Smith (1984) demonstrated that individuals may become more attracted to an unsuccessful group than a successful group even though there are negative consequences associative with this membership.

Although BLASTing accounted for why fans did not distance themselves from losing team, the use of BLASTing has also occurred in situations when their team wins. Hostile and aggressive acts have been observed by fans in situations where their team
wins. The riot by fans in Dallas, Texas following the Cowboys Super Bowl victory in 1994 or the upheaval by Buckeye fans in Columbus, Ohio after the 1995 Notre Dame football victory can not be explained by the BLASTing phenomenon.

The previous theories of BIRGing, CORFing and BLASTing were useful to explain why fans initially became attracted to teams and remained supportive of teams. However, these theories were tied to team performance outcomes and were inadequate to understand the underlying reason that accounted for team loyalty. Cialdini et al. (1976) demonstrated that BIRGing could account for an individuals behavior in relation to a team's successful performance. The tendency for a person to publicly support a successful sports team was driven by a need to bolster self-esteem.

Cialdini and Richardson (1980) demonstrated that individuals engaged in BLASTing to restore self-esteem. Snyder et al., (1986) found that an individual will CORF and distance oneself from a losing team to preserve and maintain self-esteem. However, these theories were all tied to performance outcomes that constrain our insight into fan loyalty. Individuals may not BIRG, BLAST or CORF in every situation and self-esteem may not be enhanced, restored or preserved. The maintenance and enhancement of self-esteem may be influenced by factors independent of winning and losing. Research in fan behavior needed to uncover the mechanism that could account for individual behavior unrelated to team performance. Fan reaction to team outcomes should depend on the degree of to which their identity is based upon group membership (e.g. Karasawa, 1991).

Wann and Branscombe (1990) developed the notion of team identification to explain how and why self-esteem could be enhanced and/or maintained without being directly tied to performance outcomes. Wann and Branscombe utilized social identification to examine various dimensions of fan behavior that resulted from identification with an athletic team. They hypothesized that individuals with high levels of
team identification would be more likely to BIRG when a team won and less likely to CORF when a team lost than fans with low to moderate levels of team identification.

To test their hypothesis, Wann and Branscombe (1990) classified subjects into groups based upon their level of team identification. Subjects were asked to describe how much enjoyment they experienced when a team was successful versus when the team was unsuccessful. Results indicated that the extent to which an individual identified with a group moderated his or her tendency to distance oneself from an unsuccessful group. The importance of group membership for an individual was thought to drive this team identification. Individuals whose identities were strongly based on group membership were more sensitive to outcomes than those individuals whose identities are not based upon membership. Wann and Branscombe (1990) proposed that a fan's tendency to engage in sport behavior (i.e. BIRGing, CORFing) may be moderated by his or her level of team identification.

Team identification was thought to be the mechanism that could account for why fans proclaim their association with a team after a win and would not denounce their association with a team after a loss. Team identification differed from previous research in that it was not tied to performance outcomes. Wann and Branscombe (1990) suggested that the degree of identification would affect the direction and strength of the relationship between an individual and subsequent behavior. What seems apparent is that the level of team identification may have a moderational role (e.g. Barron & Kenny, 1986) that explains when a fan will differentially selected a particular coping strategy (i.e. BIRGing, BLASTing and CORFing).

The level of identification may influence a fan to select alternative strategies to cope with a threat to in-group and identity that affects self-esteem. Person's high in team (i.e. in-group) identification would not CORF because of what membership represents to a person's identity. Without an association with the in-group (i.e. team), a person's identity
would not be anchored and void of any reference point. The ability to draw emotional and value significance from membership would no longer be available. This inability may ultimately lead to a reduction or complete loss of self-esteem.

To avoid the reduction or loss of self-esteem, individuals with high levels of team identification may select a strategy that reinforces their association (i.e. BLASTing; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). When a group is negatively evaluated by out-group members, in-group members will maintain and protect their self-esteem by reinforcing their membership to the in-group (Karasawa, 1991; Turner & Oakes, 1989). Fans that derive self-esteem from an association with a sports team would not be inclined to denounce their association with the team when it lost. Instead, these fans would reinforce and pronounce their association and allegiance to a team, thus, maintaining and protecting their self-esteem. The implications of this reinforced association would be that fans would become more committed and this commitment would manifest itself in behavior. Previous research using in-group identification and social identity suggests that the identification with a group has important implications for determining different types of behavior (Brewer, 1979).

Branscombe and Wann (1991) extended their research on team identification and demonstrated that several cognitive and affective differences could be observed based upon an individual's degree of team identification. Fans with high levels of team identification were found to exhibit greater psychological arousal, feelings of self-worth and life satisfaction. Wann and Branscombe (1993) developed a 7-item instrument to measure individual differences by examining the degree of identification with a sports team. Team identification referred to the degree to which the association with a team contributed to a fan's social identity.

The results of Wann and Branscombe's (1993) study indicated that individuals exhibited different cognitive and emotional behavior based upon the degree to which they
identified with a sports team. As identification with a sports team increased, individuals reported more involvement with the team, displayed more ego-enhancing with regards to team's success, had more positive expectations for future contest and indicated a greater willingness to invest larger amounts of time and money to watch their team play. The utility of Wann and Branscombe’s (1993) Team Identification scale was that it provided a means to investigate spectator behavior and make some predictions concerning fans’ attitudes and behaviors.

Team identification has one component that may contribute to our understanding of the psychological process that account for fan loyalty. The Team ID scale appears to assess aspects of the behavioral dimension of team loyalty such as the likelihood of BIRGing and CORFing based upon level of identification and team performance (See Appendix A for scale). Item’s #4 and #7 measured the frequency of loyal behavior. For example, item # 4 ask:

"During the season, how closely do you follow the K. U. basketball team via ANY of the following: a) in person or on television, b) on the radio, or c) television news or a newspaper?" (Wann & Branscombe, 1993; p. 5).

However, these measures were limited in that they tried to assess BIRGing and CORFing using one-item measures that have multiple responses embedded in each question. In addition, the remaining items appeared conceptually weak in addressing the attitudinal component of loyalty.

Although team identification provided insight into the behavioral component of team loyalty, its application to the attitudinal component has not been well developed. Team identification does have some interesting implications for the attitudinal component of team loyalty. Four items (i.e. # 1, 2, 3 and 5) appear to assess the importance an individual placed upon their fanship toward and athletic team. The importance individuals place on being associated with an athletic team reflects the importance they place upon their attitudes toward being a fan of that team. High levels of team identification provide
individuals with a means to develop a social identity that has emotional and value
significance. Sports fans who demonstrate high levels of team identification are likely to
place a great deal of psychological significance on their attitudes toward fanship. This
suggests that team identification may operate as one determinant of attitude importance.
The determinants of attitude properties and subsequent strength continues to intrigue
scholars in social psychology (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Attention is not turned to
conceptually develop one determinant of attitude strength in a sports domain.

Origins of Attitude Strength

Given that there exist a high similarity among attitude properties (Bassili, 1996;
Krosnick et al., 1993), it is conceivable that one specific attitude may affect other
properties. As one attitude property becomes stronger, over time it may reverberate
throughout the whole dimensional system and produce higher levels on the rest of the
dimensions (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Tesser (1978) demonstrated that thinking about an
attitude object increased its extremity. Although research has demonstrated various
attitude properties do not represent one underlying construct (e.g. Abelson, 1988;
Krosnick et al., 1993), it is possible that certain groups of dimensions could overlap and
combine to form a latent construct (Krosnick & Petty, 1995).

In order to derive at an understanding of the origins of attitude strength, Krosnick
and Abelson (1992) suggested that one should, "make a theoretical and practical
commitment to a particular strength measures, and work out its relationship to other
found 87 empirical studies on attitude importance. Drawing upon Abelson and Krosnick's
recommendation, the present study attempted to theoretically develop the dimension of
attitude importance to understand it's relationship to team identification and the attitudinal
component of fan loyalty.
Attitude Importance and Team Identification

Previous work in fan behavior indicated that team identification (Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993) provides emotive significance for an individual's self-concept and would be a likely determinant of attitude importance (i.e. Team Importance). The more an individual perceives their association with a team as favorable and providing emotional and value significance, the more likely he or she would attach importance to their attitude in regards to fanship. Holtz and Miller (1985) demonstrated that important attitudes helped shape an individual's liking of social groups. Students that reported membership in certain social groups (i.e. fraternities) who held personally important attitudes on issues tended to agree with in-group and disagree with out-group members (Holtz & Miller, 1985).

Attitude importance reflected an individual's subjective sense of the concern, caring and significance he or she attached to an attitude (Krosnick, 1988). Fans that demonstrate strong attitudes toward sports team are likely to place a great deal of importance on their attitudes toward that team. The attachment of personal importance to an attitude represents a substantial commitment by an individual to think, gather information, to use this information in making relevant decisions about an attitude and to designs one's actions in accordance with that attitude (Boninger et al., 1995; Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Petty, Cacioppo, & Haugtvedt, 1992). The importance an individual places upon his or her attitude towards a sports team should be determined by the evaluation of that association and membership with the team in terms of some degree of favor or disfavor.

Boninger et al., (1995) examined the origins of attitude importance and hypothesized that social identification was one determinant of attitude importance. Attitude importance was equated to a belief suggesting that, "perceiving an attitude to be personally important leads people to use it in processing information, making decisions,
and taking action" (Boninger et al., 1995; p. 62). Attitude importance represents and individuals subjective belief concerning the significance he or she placed on an attitude toward an object or issue (Wood, Kallgren, & Presler, 1985). This significance reflects a psychological commitment or investment on the part of the individual to his or her attitude (Crosby & Taylor, 1983).

Boninger et al., (1995) conducted five correlational studies to explain why various political attitudes were personally important. They found that social identification accounted for 18% of statements and was a significant predictor of attitude importance. Boninger et al., (1995) concluded attitude importance may be a result of social identification due to an individual's attitude being shaped by reference groups. These findings suggest that social identification motivates individuals to become personally invested in particular attitudes. Strong identification with a reference group that places importance on a particular attitude would motivate an individual to attach similar importance to his or her own attitudes. An individual who places importance on their membership within a group is likely to adopt attitudinal preferences in line with the group's collective attitudes toward an object or issue.

Results from correlational studies implied that social identification operated as an antecedent of attitude importance (Boninger, Krosnick & Berent, 1995). This would suggest that team identification could operate as a determinant of attitude importance. The link between attitude importance and social identification was further explored by Boninger, Krosnick, Berent, and Fabrigar (1995) in their examination of causes and consequences of attitude importance. These researchers reviewed the existing literature in attempts to understand the cognitive, motivational and behavioral consequences of attaching importance to an attitude. Attitude importance was suggested to operate in a subjective capacity that reflects and individuals, "subjective sense of concern, caring, and significance he or she attaches to an attitude" (Boninger et al., 1995; p. 160).
The subjectivity of attitude importance has been found to motivate an individual to selectively process and elaborate on personally relevant information (Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1986b; Petty, Cacioppo & Haugtvedt 1992; Petty, Cacioppo, Schumann, 1983; Schumann, Petty & Clemons, 1990). Boninger et al., (1995) suggested that attitude importance determined attitude strength by enhancing attitude extremity, accessibility, consistency, and the organization of relevant knowledge in memory. Social identification was hypothesized to attribute to this attitude importance by influencing the kinds of information and individual will select and elaborate upon. These results suggest that fans with higher levels of team identification (i.e. loyalty) would select and elaborate on information concerning a team differently than fans with low levels of identification. As a result, highly identified fans would incorporate this information into their attitudinal framework thereby strengthening their attitude toward a team (e.g. Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995).

Although recent work in social psychology supports the notion that social identification may operate as a determinant of attitude importance (Boninger et al., 1995; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Petty, Cacioppo, Haugtvedt, 1992) more empirical research is needed to validate this assumption. In the area of fan loyalty, the impact that team identification has on attitude importance may provide a means to assess one assumed origin of attitude importance. However, importance's relationship to loyalty would first have to be demonstrated before subsequent efforts could be made to conduct this type of inquiry.

Benefits of Team Importance

One means to the importance of an athletic team would be to examine the benefits that fan's receive from sport involvement. Fans may seek social interaction and social approval (Zyto-Sitkiewcz, 1991) and derive importance from social activities surrounding
sport (Wenner & Gantz, 1989). Fans may also derive feelings of belongingness through their association with a successful sports team (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Wann & Branscombe, 1993).

The notion of social interaction was illustrated by Rooney (1975) in his Fan Region Theory. This theory highlighted geographical proximity as a factor which contributes to social interactions. The Fan Region Theory proposed that an inverse relationship exist between a fan's geographical location and that of the teams. Support for a team was found to decrease as the distance between the team and the fan increased which indicated that fans will support their local teams. Additional studies have supported Rooney's (1975) Fan Region Theory (e.g. Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Smith, Patterson, Williams & Hogg, 1981). Shelly and Curtian (1984) demonstrated that geographical regions of support could be identified for each major league baseball team.

Results of these studies suggest that sports teams may become important for fans by allowing fans to engage in social interaction. Through this social interaction, fans may incur increased social contact with others as well feelings of belongingness (Wann & Branscombe, 1993). The propensity to engage in team support may also reflect a fans need for social approval. Fans may demonstrate support for a team in order to derive socially perceived benefits such as approval from others (Cialdini et al., 1976). Previous studies have found a relationship between team success and attendance (Baade & Tiehan, 1991; Becker & Suls, 1983; Greenstein & Marcum, 1981; Hansen & Gauthier, 1989; Smith et al., 1981; Wann & Branscombe, 1991).

Taken together, these studies suggest that team importance may result from the social aspects involved in fanship. Branscombe and Wann (1991) found that identification with a team fostered a sense of attachment regardless of team performance. This type of attachment would represent the importance placed upon individual as well as group identification (e.g. Brewer, 1991; Tajfel, 1982). Wann et al., (1995) demonstrated that
individuals who maintained their association with an unsuccessful group had higher levels of group identification than those who did not associate with the group. Group identity produces feelings of belongingness and self-worth that reinforces the importance of that identity (Abrams & Hogg, 1990; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Research in social identity has demonstrated that increasing the importance of a group can increase levels of self-esteem (Brewer, 1979).

Thus, it would seem that team identification would operate similar to group identification by increasing the importance an individual places on their association with a team. Fans who demonstrate high levels of team identification would likely to place a great deal more importance upon their attitudes than individuals with low team identification. In the context of the attitudinal component of team loyalty, team identification might be one determinant of attitude importance. In the team sports domain, it is theoretically possible that team identification could induce higher levels of attitude importance. Higher levels of attitude importance might then possibly reverberate throughout the rest of the attitude properties and over time produce higher levels on the rest of the attitude dimensions (e.g. Krosnick and Petty, 1995).

The importance fans place on their attitudes toward a team enables and understanding of why some fans support a team more than others. Important attitudes would be more likely to reflect a psychological commitment to a team that an unimportant attitudes. One reason for this psychological commitment and investment in an attitude may be team identification. Based upon the Krosnick and Abelson's (1992) recommendation, the attitude strength dimension of importance was theoretically developed to investigate one possible origin of attitude importance.

Taken together, this body of research suggests Social Identification (i.e. team identification) could operate as a compelling antecedent of attitude importance. However, in order to empirically verify this assumption, attitude importance would first have to be
found the most influential attitude property linked to fan loyalty. Various attitude properties could be investigated simultaneously and scores on the importance dimension would need to be significantly higher than the other dimensions.

In situations where individuals have been loyal to a team for an extended period of time, attitude importance may have strengthened the other properties through reverberation and differences may not be found (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995). One might only find differences in importance when a fan's loyalty toward a team is relatively new. Likewise, it may be the case that importance and accessibility are equally strong. Levels of attitude importance toward a team would likely be related to the accessibility of those attitudes toward the team (e.g. Fazio, 1995; Krosnick, 1989; Williams & Fazio, 1986). Another plausible finding would be importance, accessibility, extremity, knowledge, and affective-cognitive consistency would group together to from a single underlying dimension of attitude strength apart form the other dimensions (e.g. Boninger, et al., 1995; Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Regardless of the inherent number of plausible outcomes and constraints, attitude importance's theoretical relationships with team identification remains an advantageous point to begin an examination of one origin of attitude strength in a sport domain.

In order to explore the structural relations among attitude properties and fan loyalty, a multiple indicator multitrait-multimethod analysis could be utilized from social psychology (e.g. Krosnick et al., 1993). A fifty-one item scale measuring fifty-one observed variables could be adapted from Krosnick et al.'s, (1993) study into a sports context to measure the influence of ten attitude properties on loyalty toward an athletic team. Once the structural relation among the ten attitude properties and loyalty was identified, attempts could be made to experimentally induce changes in the structure of loyalty to test stability. In order to induce change on attitude dimensions, a persuasive
communication would have to be developed. Attention is now turned to examine experimental methodology used in social psychology to induce attitude change.

The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM)

The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; 1986) represents a framework to organize social psychological research on persuasion. The model integrated existing persuasion theory and literature under one conceptual umbrella and has been applied successfully to study the effects of motivational and ability factors on attitude persistence, resistance and change in a persuasion context (Andrews & Shimp, 1990; DeBono & Harnish, 1988; Cacioppo, Petty, Kao, & Rodriguez, 1986; Cacioppo & Petty, 1982; Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Haugtvedt, Petty, & Cacioppo, 1992; Petty & Cacioppo, 1984b; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983; Schumann, Petty, & Clemons, 1990; Verplanken, 1991). The ELM represents a general framework for understanding the effectiveness of persuasive communications.

In a persuasion context, the model's strength lies in its ability to account for the number of ways a variable may influence the persuasion process. The ELM postulates that the strength of an attitude is based upon the amount of issue relevant thinking (i.e. elaboration) a person does about an attitude object (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). The model proposes that different methods may induce persuasion and may work best depending upon whether elaboration likelihood of a persuasive appeal is high or low.

Previous to the ELM, there existed little agreement among persuasion theorists (Chaiken, 1980; Chaiken & Eagly, 1976; Festinger, 1957; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1972; Heider, 1958; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) concerning how stimuli affected an individual's susceptibility to a persuasive appeal. The ELM integrated the conflicting findings from previous literature into an extended model which posits that elaboration likelihood moderates the route to persuasion. It specifies the conditions under which persuasion
should be mediated by message-related thinking and postulates that alternative peripheral mechanisms account for persuasion when these conditions are not met (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

The ELM proposed that cognitive effort is neither universally mindless nor thoughtless in evaluating a persuasive appeal (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984). It postulated that dispositional and situational factors combined to determine an individual's motivation to process a persuasive message and think carefully about the merits of the arguments presented. Cognitive effort represented the amount of message elaboration that was likely to take place in response to a persuasive appeal (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Message elaboration exists upon a continuum which is anchored at the high end by what is called the central route to persuasion and at the low end by the peripheral route to persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984a).

Central route processing represents high elaboration likelihood and occurs under conditions where motivation and ability to engage in issue-relevant thinking are fostered (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b). Individuals have both the motivation and ability to evaluate the merits of the attitude object. Resulting attitudes from central route processing are predicted to be stronger, persistent, resistant and more predictive of behavior (Cacioppo, Petty, Kao, & Rodriguez, 1986; Haugtvedt, Schumann, Schneier, & Warren, 1994; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1984a).

Peripheral route processing occurs in low elaboration likelihood situations where conditions do not stimulate motivation or ability to engage in issue-relevant thinking (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). These individuals lack either the motivation or ability to evaluate issue relevant arguments and utilize simple cues to form attitudes. Attitude change via the peripheral route does not represent a careful attempt by the individual to evaluate the true merits of the advocated position and are postulated to be relatively weaker and less stable (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).
High elaboration suggests that an individual allocates cognitive resources toward issue-relevant thinking which are central to the attitude object in the persuasive appeal. This attitude becomes part of the attitude object's schema and is expected to be more resistant and predictive of subsequent behavior because: a) the recipient is more likely to relate incoming information to previous experience and knowledge creating more confidence, b) the attitude will be accessible at the point of behavior and c) appropriate behavior towards the object becomes more relevant (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984). High elaboration also suggests that an object in a persuasive appeal is of high personal relevance, the individual has a high degree of knowledge about the object, the message is simple and there is little distraction (Petty et al., 1994). This recipient typically knows what he/she wants and is able to evaluate the merits of the arguments presented in an advertising message.

Peripheral route processing occurred when an individual associates the attitude issue or object with a positive or negative cue or makes a simple inference about the merits of the advocated position based upon various simple cues in the persuasion context (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). Peripheral formed attitudes are postulated to be relatively less persistent, resistant and less predictive of behavior (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b). Peripheral route processing occurs when the likelihood of message elaboration is low.

Low elaboration suggests that an individual will adopt a strategy that either conserves cognitive resources or applies them toward other task besides the persuasive appeal. A message recipient develops his/her attitude based upon a superficial analyses of the appeal (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). The acceptance or rejection of an appeal is based upon a) the issue or object's association with a positive or negative cue and b) a simple inference based upon various cues in the persuasion context (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984). Low elaboration suggests that an individual has little knowledge or low personal relevance
with an object in an advertising appeal. The message may be complex or there may be considerable distraction when processing the appeal (Petty et al., 1994). The merits of an appeal may not be evaluated because he/she chooses not to or does not have the ability or knowledge to process the appeal.

The ELM postulates that there are many situational and dispositional variables capable of moderating the route to persuasion and that these variables can be distinguished by their affect on 1) motivational properties to process an appeal (e.g. personal relevance and need for cognition) and 2) ability properties to process an appeal (e.g. external distraction, general intelligence) (Petty et al., 1994). A further distinction can be found among these variables by analyzing motivational and ability factors in relation to: a) the situational context of the persuasive appeal, b) the individual characteristics of the recipient, c) objective amount of thinking and d) message evaluation bias (Petty et al., 1994).

Furthermore, the ELM postulated that one variable may serve multiple roles and affect a persuasion situation in four distinct ways (Petty & Cacioppo, 1990; Petty, Kasmer, Haugeveld, 1987). A variable may serve as a persuasive argument when it provides information concerning the attributional merits of an object or issue in a persuasive appeal (i.e. number or quality of argument). A variable may also serve as a peripheral cue producing attitude formation in light of considering the proposed true merits of the object or issue (i.e. attractive source). The third way a variable may affect persuasion is through affecting the extent or direction of argument elaboration (i.e. motivational extent to evaluate central merits). The final way a variable may affect persuasion is by determining the types of thoughts generated (i.e. determine bias thinking).

The specific utility of adopting the ELM in a sports context is to understand the processes through which a fan elaborates upon a persuasive message and their subsequent responses. The extent of elaboration would depend upon message processing (i.e.
thinking about the message) and influenced by motivational (i.e. loyalty) as well as ability determinants. Examples of motivational determinants are personal relevance, violation of expectancies, source of message, need for cognition and temporal states. Examples of ability determinants are distraction, intelligence, complexity of message and posture (Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995). These determinants may affect elaboration by themselves or may interact to determine message processing.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether differences in team loyalty could be explained by ten attitude properties. Brand loyalty literature was reviewed to determine the most appropriate means to assess the loyalty construct. Attitude strength literature was examined to explore the hypothesized structural relations among various attitude dimensions and loyalty toward an athletic team. Literature on social identification, attitude strength and fan behavior were integrated to theoretically develop the dimension of attitude importance and its relationship to one possible origin of attitude strength.

Important attitudes reflect attitudes that individuals attach a great deal of psychological significance and value to (Boninger et al., 1995; Krosnick, 1988a). The importance individuals place upon their social identity reflects the subjective sense of concern, caring and significance they attach to their attitudes concerning that identity (Boninger et al., 1995). Fans who demonstrate high levels of identification should place a great deal of importance on their attitudes toward their favorite team and be useful in the prediction of loyalty.

The second purpose of this study was to examine whether changes in attitude structure could be observed through a persuasive technique to investigate the stability of each attitude property and the influence of loyalty on information processing. An
experimental design was developed based upon the theoretical framework of the ELM (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; 1986b) to induce appropriate change. Changes in structural properties were hypothesized to occur as a result of selective exposure and elaboration of information relevant to a team. This type of information processing should lead to the formation of stronger attitudinal properties that in turn would bolster attitude strength and produce more team loyalty.

Attitude importance has been found to be a determinant of attitude strength by increasing the selectivity and exposure of relevant information (Boninger et al., 1995; Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Haugtvedt, Schumann, Schneier, & Warren, 1994; Petty, Cacioppo & Schumann, 1983; Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995; Schumann, Petty, & Clemons, 1990). Therefore, fans who demonstrate important attitudes towards a sports team should be more motivated to process relevant information, selective in the types of information reported and generate a greater number of thoughts about a team.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The present study explored the structural relations and stability among ten latent dimensions of attitude properties and an individual's loyalty to an athletic team using an 2 x 2 x 3 mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA). The independent variables investigated were: extremity, intensity, certainty, importance, knowledge, accessibility, personal relevance, latitude of rejection, direct experience and affective-cognitive consistency. The dependent variable investigated was loyalty.

The current study involved three phases. The purpose of Phase I was to explore the appropriate structural model to predict loyalty from latent dimension of an individual's attitude toward the Cleveland Indians. The purpose of Phase II was to develop and test a persuasive message that could be used to induce changes in attitude structure toward the Cleveland Indians. The purpose of Phase III was to examine the structural stability of an individual's attitude and whether changes could be induced through exposing individuals to messages related to the Cleveland Indians. This chapter has been divided into four sections: participants, instrumentation, procedures and limitations were discussed.

Participants: The Sample

In Phase I, a non-random procedure was used to select the original pool of subjects (N=379) from two introductory undergraduate marketing course at The Ohio State University. The use of a non-random sample was preferred since the goal of Phase I of the study was theory application and not effects application (Calder, Phillips, & Tybout, 86.
Based upon Hair et al.'s (1996) recommendation to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis (e.g. sample size of 200 to 300) and Stevens' (1992) factor analysis recommendation of 5 to 1 ratio of responses to each scale item, a large number of students were needed to conduct Phase I.

Students were approached during class and asked to complete the Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey as well as a survey which contained a bank of personality variables during week three of Winter quarter 1998. Three hundred and eighty four students completed the survey. From this group, five surveys were eliminated due to incomplete responses. Therefore, the final sample size for Phase I was \( N = 379 \).

In Phase II, forty-seven students from the original sample volunteered to participate in a pre-testing session of a persuasive message conducted during week six of winter quarter for extra course credit. Pre-testing establishes the validity and reliability of the message manipulation (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1986b) and can generally be conducted using a sub-sample of 30 to 40 participants from the original sample. The response rate for Phase II was 100% with all forty-seven students (\( N = 47 \)) showing up at their designated time and completing the packet of material. These students were excluded from participation in Phase III.

In Phase III, one hundred and forty nine (\( N = 149 \)) students from the original sample volunteered to participate in an experiment conducted during week eight of winter quarter for extra course credit. Eleven experimental sessions were conducted over a two day period on groups which ranged from 10 to 17 participants. In the experiment, participants were randomly given either (a) a pro attitudinal Indians message (\( n = 52 \)), (b) a counter attitudinal Indians message (\( n = 55 \)) or (c) a message related to the Milwaukee Brewers (\( n = 42 \)). Participants were then asked to complete the Cleveland Indians Baseball survey a second time. The response rate for Phase III was 100%.
A power analysis was used to approximate the number of participants needed for Phase III. A power analysis informs the researcher how many participants are necessary in order to detect any effects of a treatment, given a) the size of the effect, b) the type of statistical test utilized, and c) the level of significance (Rudestam & Newton, 1992). The number of participants needed for Phase III was determined by calculating a medium effect size ($\omega^2 = .06$) that an experiment produces (Cohen, 1977) and using a power chart (Pearson & Hartley, 1972) to determine sample size at $\alpha = .05$.

This procedure allows for a researcher to control for a Type II error in behavioral and social sciences. Researchers have regarded effects of "medium strength" ($\omega^2 = .06$) to be meaningful and certainly worthy of study (Cooper & Findley, 1982; Keppel, 1991; Seldlmeier & Gigerenzer, 1989). The level of power expresses the probability of avoiding a Type II error (i.e. failure to reject a null hypothesis when it is false).

Power reflects the degree to which a researcher can detect treatment differences and the chances that others will be able to duplicate findings when the experiment is repeated. Consensus among researcher as to an appropriate level of power has not been reached. However, some have agreed that a power of .80 represents a reasonable and realistic value for research in the behavioral sciences (Cohen, 1977; Hinkle & Oliver, 1983; Keppel, 1991; Rudestam & Newton, 1992). Per Keppel's (1991) recommendation, the calculated sample size needed for Phase III was $N = 150$ with a cell size of $n = 50$ for each of the three message conditions. This sample was designed to detect differences in treatment effects with a medium effect size and power of .80 at alpha level of .05.

Instrumentation: Team Selection

A major concern in the design of the current study involved the selection of the athletic team. The selected team needed to provide enough variability in loyalty and interest to classify participants in to high, moderate and low loyalty conditions. In
addition, the team needed to invoke sufficient differences in levels of attitude strength to measure structural differences on various attitude dimensions.

Team selection was conducted using a pre-test of five sports teams: two collegiate and three professional sport teams during autumn quarter 1997. Collegiate sports were included in the pre-test because of the extremely high involvement that is associated with collegiate teams, especially among college students (Zillman, Bryant, & Sapolsky, 1989). Spectators of collegiate teams have been identified as highly allegiant and generally demonstrate extreme identification scores (Wann & Branscombe, 1993). Other authors have indicated most highly allegiant fans are those supporting college teams (Goldstein & Arms, 1971; Schurr, Ruble, & Ellen, 1985). Thus, The Ohio State University men's football and basketball teams were included in the pre-test because of popularity, general awareness of the team, geographical proximity and high level of support the each receives among Ohio State students.

Professional sport teams were selected in the pre-test because of the general level of interest they attract and their pervasiveness in American society (Sage, 1980; Smith, 1988). Sport franchises generate fan support based upon their geographical location (Rooney, 1975; Shelly & Curtain, 1984). Professional teams come to represent the communities where fans currently reside or have resided in the past. In addition, professional sport may not generate the same high level of involvement as college teams do among college students which could lead to greater between subject variability (Zillman, Bryant, Sapolsky, 1989). Three professional teams were selected for the pre-test: the Columbus Crew, Cleveland Indians, and Cincinnati Bengals. Professional teams were selected due to geographical proximity to Columbus, general awareness among Ohio residents and level of support received among Ohio State students.

A 60-item questionnaire was designed to assess students' attitudes and behaviors toward the Columbus Crew, Ohio State men's football, Ohio State men's varsity
basketball, Cleveland Indians, and Cincinnati Bengals (See Appendix B for team pre-test questionnaire). The questionnaire was distributed to 40 Ohio State students (N=40). A composite score was calculated for each team from subjects' responses to the scale. Based upon pretest results, the Cleveland Indians were selected as the team for the study. Of the five teams pre-tested, the Cleveland Indians provided appropriate levels of variability in attitude (SD = 3.27; VAR = 10.68).

The mean, standard deviations, variance, minimum and maximum scores for each team are presented in Table 3.1. Subjects' attitude score (M = 7.04) for the Indians was approximately in the middle of the range of scores 1.80 to 14.33. The Bengals and Crew were the lowest rated teams in terms of mean attitude scores and variances while the OSU football had the highest (M = 10.45, lowest SD = 1.28 and least VAR = 1.63).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengals</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Basketball</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Football</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Team Pre-Test Results

Although OSU men's basketball team M = 6.77 and a VAR = 6.15 demonstrated sufficient variability, it was not considered due to the possible confound of the upcoming NCAA season which would coincide with the study.
Attitude Scale Development

Another concern for the present study was the adaptation of Krosnick et al., (1993) 51-item attitude dimension scale into a sport domain. Krosnick et al.,'s (1993) attitude dimension scale was selected because it has been incorporated to measure properties of various dimensions of attitude strength in two previous empirical studies. The scale has been proven valid and reliable in reporting Ohio State undergraduate students attitudes toward two different social phenomenon (e.g. capital punishment and abortion). Since the scale was developed to measure student's attitudinal responses to a phenomenon, it should be appropriate for the target population in the present study. However, this scale was used to measure students attitudes toward abortion and capital punishment and needed modifications to examine participants' attitudes toward the Cleveland Indians.

The attitude properties scale was modified into a sport domain from previous studies designed to measure the relations among latent dimensions of attitude strength (Bassili, 1996; Judd & Krosnick, 1982; Krosnick & Abelson, 1992; Krosnick et al., 1993; Wegener et al., 1995). Table 3.2 highlights the procedure used for instrumentation development. Responses to questions were measured using multiple formats ranging from 2-point, 3-point, 4-point, 5-point, 7-point, 100 point thermometer scale with label points of 0, 50 and 100, Thrustone ranked order, and semantic differential scales.
Procedural Steps taken for Scale Development

**Attitude Dimensions:**
- **Stage 1:** Item Generation (Krosnick et al., 1993; Bassili, 1996)
- **Stage 2:** Validity: 9 Panel of Experts
- **Stage 3:** Reliability: Pilot Test (N=21)
- **Stage 4:** Lat Rej and Aff-Cog Development
  - Lat Rej: Thurstone Procedure (N=32)
  - Lat Rej: Re-Test (N=22)
  - Aff-Cog: Field Test (N=20)
  - Aff-Cog: Pilot Test (N=32)

**Loyalty Dimensions:**
- **Stage 1:** Item Generation
  - Commitment: (Crosby & Taylor, 1983; Pritchard, 1991)
  - Behavioral: (Literature, Advisors)
- **Stage 2:** Validity: 9 Panel of Experts
- **Stage 3:** Validity and Reliability: Field Test: (N=15)
- **Stage 4:** Reliability: Pilot Test (N=37)

Table 3.2 Summary of Instrumentation Development

A first draft of the attitude dimension scale was developed from Krosnick et al.'s (1993) scale by changing the wording and context as well as the attitude object from capital punishment and abortion to the Cleveland Indians (See Appendix C for summary of Krosnick et al.,'s 1993 scale). Next the instrument was tested for validity. Validity is the most important idea to consider when preparing an instrument for use (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). There are several types of validity to consider when constructing an instrument. Face validity refers to the degree to which an instrument looks or appears appropriate for an intended audience. Content validity is the degree to which an instrument measures the intended content area. Each item on the instrument must be judged for its presumed relevance to the variable being measured to determine content validity.

Face and content validity were established by a panel of nine experts. These experts included two undergraduate students in the Sport, Fitness and Health program,
two doctoral students in Sport Management, one doctoral student in Psychology, two professors of Sport Management, one professor in Consumer Psychology, and an administrator from an Athletic Department. These individuals were furnished with information regarding the purpose of the study, a copy of the survey and specific directions to assist them in making judgments. Each panel member was asked to rate each item on the instrument as well as the entire instrument for content, clarity wording, format, thoroughness, ease of use, focus and appropriateness. Based upon the feedback from the panel of experts, two items were deleted and two items were consolidated.

A second draft of the attitude dimension scale was developed which contained 48-items representing the ten attitude dimensions (See Appendix D). A pilot test was conducted using twenty one Ohio State students ($N=21$) during autumn quarter 1997. Undergraduate students from Ohio State were chosen for the pilot test because of they are representative sample of the target population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). As per Churchill's (1979) recommendation, Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha was used to examine the measure's internal consistency. The reliability for the scale was $\alpha = .89$.

Reliability relates to the relative absence of errors of measurement in an instrument. Errors of measurement are always present to some degree but can be reduced with a reliable instrument. Errors of measurement maybe due to a variety of factors such as differences in motivation, energy, anxiety, and a different testing situation (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). A useful rule of thumb is that reliability coefficients should be at least .70 and preferably higher in the social sciences (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Nunnally, 1978). Although the scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .89, the results of the pilot test and an examination of the item-to- total correlations suggested that the dimensions of cognitive-affective consistency and latitude of rejection were not stable. These two dimensions were redeveloped. In order to create valid and reliable measure, a Thurstone (1928) technique was used to develop the item to measure the latitude of rejection
A semantic differential scale technique (e.g. Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) was utilized to develop the affective-cognitive consistency measure.

To develop the measure for latitude rejection, a Thurstone and Chave (1929) equally appearing intervals and Saffir (1937) successive interval scale development procedure was used. A panel of seven experts in the field of sport management submitted sentences that were either favorable or unfavorable toward the Cleveland Indians. The panel of experts included four professors in Sport Management and three doctoral students in sport management. A pool of 95 sentences were collected. Ambiguous or redundant sentences were eliminated and a final pool of 51 sentences was created.

All 51 sentences were placed on an instrument in random order and given to a panel of thirty two (N=32) undergraduate student judges winter quarter 1998 (See Appendix E for instrument). Student judges rated each sentence on how unfavorable or favorable the sentence was toward the Cleveland Indians on Likert-type scale ranging from [1] extremely unfavorable to [9] extremely favorable. Judges were instructed not to base their decision on the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statement. Each judge assigned a weight from 1 to 9 for each sentence in essence creating 9 categories or piles of sentences. Judges were asked to conceptualize the nine categories as being equidistant.

The median and standard deviation for each item was then calculated. The median was used to account for extreme scores on a particular item from a single judge. Based upon the results of the student judges, nine statements were selected that had highest agreement from the judges (i.e. lowest standard deviations) and common medians. Each of the nine sentences were assigned a scale value 1 through 9, based upon the judges median scores and standard deviations, to create equally appearing scale intervals.

A reliability test was conducted to ascertain the internal consistency of the nine sentences relative to the Cleveland Indians. The nine sentences were placed on an
instrument and given to twenty two (N=22) undergraduate students during winter quarter 1998 (See Appendix F). Students were instructed to rank each sentence from 1 to 9 based upon how unfavorable or favorable they perceived the sentences. The median score and standard deviation for each sentence were calculated and matched results obtained from the first group of student judges (See Table 3.3).

Each sentence was placed by both groups of student judges in the same ranked order from extremely unfavorable [1] to extremely favorable [9] and received the same scale weight (i.e. median) for a 100% match (See Table 3.3). As indicated in Table 3.3, sentence #2 was rated the most unfavorable (median = 1) while sentence #5 was rated the most favorable (median = 9). Hence, these nine sentences were included on the Indians scale that represented equally appearing intervals from unfavorable to favorable and ranged from 1 to 9. Per Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif (1957), the total number of sentences an individual indicated as objectionable would be used to form the latitude of rejection measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time 1 Median</th>
<th>Time 2 Median</th>
<th>Time 2 SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 22
Median = sentence favorability rating

Table 3.3 Thrustone Scale Results for Latitude of Rejection Measure

The measure for the affective-cognitive consistency was developed through a field test and pilot test. Twelve adjective pairs were selected to measure participants' feelings toward the Cleveland Indians and twelve adjective pairs were selected to measure participants' beliefs about the Cleveland Indians. Per Osgood, Suci, and Tanenbaum's (1957), each adjective pair was placed at the ends of a semantic differential scale. The semantic differential procedure provides an advantage over other scaling techniques (e.g. Guttman, Likert, Thrustone) in that it allows for comparisons of attitudes across different attitude objects (e.g. social groups, social policies) and has become the most popular method of measuring attitudes and creating an attitudinal index (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

A field test was conducted autumn quarter 1997 using twenty (N=20) Ohio State undergraduate students. Students were asked to rate their feeling and beliefs about the Cleveland Indians baseball team on 24 semantic differential scales. The results were analyzed using the mean scores and variance for each pair of adjectives in relation to each concept. Ten items were selected for both the affective and cognitive concepts based upon their common means scores and large variance scores. These items were then tested...
during a pilot test winter quarter 1998 (See Appendix G). Thirty-two Ohio State undergraduates \(N=32\) rated their feelings and beliefs about the Cleveland Indians on a set of twenty adjective pairs. Based upon results of the pilot test, seven adjective pairs for the affective concept \((\alpha = .96)\) and seven adjective pairs for the cognitive concept \((\alpha = .95)\) were included on the Cleveland Indians baseball survey. An index was created for both the affective and cognitive component and would be used to measure the difference in consistency between an individuals feelings and beliefs toward the Cleveland Indians.

**Loyalty Scale Development**

The development of a loyalty scale was another concern for this study. Presently a published scale does not exist that adequately measures both the attitudinal and behavioral components of loyalty to athletic teams. No instrument was found that assessed these two dimensions of team loyalty. For the purpose of this study, a loyalty scale was developed to measure an individual's loyalty in terms of attitudinal commitment (Crosby & Taylor, 1983) and behavior to the Cleveland Indians. Scale items were generated from a review of the literature and feedback from a panel of experts. The attitudinal dimension development of this instrument relied heavily upon the work of Pritchard (1991) and Mahony (1995, Unpublished) in the area of psychological commitment. Psychological commitment items were drawn from Crosby and Taylor's (1983) work on resistance to change, Haugtvedt and Petty (1992) and Haugtvedt and Wegener (1994) research on attitude strength and resistance. Psychological commitment items emphasize the importance of resistance to change as a critical factor underlying loyalty to a leisure program and an athletic team. As such, these items would provide an index of attitudinal consequence to measure the ten attitude dimensions.

The current study adapted items for the attitudinal dimension from previous commitment scales and adjusted the wording and context. The behavioral items for the
loyalty scale were generated by the author in conjunction with advisors and after an extensive review of the relevant literature. These behavioral measures items tapped into the dimensions of attendance, watching/listening, wearing/purchasing of team paraphernalia, and attention related to an athletic team. Per Churchill (1979), items were worded both positively and negatively. The loyalty scale used 7-point Likert scales ranging from (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree). Item generation led to an initial pool of 45-items. Redundant and ambiguous items were deleted which produced a 28-item scale.

The 28-item loyalty scale was developed and administered during winter quarter 1998 to fifteen (N=15) Ohio State University undergraduates in a field test session to examine the scale for validity and reliability. Based upon the field test results, the loyalty scale was reduced to 8-items measuring the attitudinal dimension and 9-items measuring the behavioral dimension. The 17-item loyalty scale was administered in a pilot test to thirty seven (N=37) Ohio State Students during winter quarter 1998. (See Appendix G for scale). The respondents were students at Ohio State University enrolled in three Sport, Health and Fitness classes. As per Churchill's (1979) recommendation, Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha was used to examine the scales internal consistency. Based upon analysis of the pilot test data, these item were selected for the final loyalty measurement which contains 17-items (α = .95).

The final version of the Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey included 76-items. Fifty-nine items were used to measure the ten dimension of attitude strength, and 17 items were used to measure loyalty. The attitude strength items and the loyalty items were randomly placed within the scale.
Measures

Sixty-one observed variables were included in the Cleveland Indians Baseball questionnaire. Forty-seven variables represented the ten latent dimension of attitude strength and seventeen variables represented the attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of loyalty. The following section describes the questions that were used for each dimension on the questionnaire.

Attitude Importance

Six variables were used to reflect attitude importance. They were:

1) How much do you personally care about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)
2) Compared to how you feel about other professional sports teams, how important are the Cleveland Indians to you? (thermometer scale)
3) How important would it be for the Cleveland Indians to be one of the teams playing for you to attend a major league baseball game? (4-point scale)
4) How important would you say the Cleveland Indians are to you personally? (7-point scale)
5) How much do the Cleveland Indians mean to you personally? (3-point scale)
6) "I care a great deal about the Cleveland Indians." (4-point scale)

Attitude Intensity

Five variables were used to represent intensity. They were:

1) Compared to how you feel about other sports teams, how strong are your feelings regarding the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)
2) Compared to how most other students feel about the Cleveland Indians, how strong are your feelings regarding the Indians? (7-point scale)
3) How intense is your attitude toward the Cleveland Indians? (thermometer scale)
4) Would you say your feelings about the Cleveland Indians are.... (4-point scale)

5) "My opinion about the Cleveland Indians is weak." (4-point scale)

**Attitude Accessibility**

Ten variables were used to assess the frequency of talking and thinking the participants engaged in about the Cleveland Indians. These items were used to reflect the accessibility of participants attitude toward the Cleveland Indians. They were:

**Talking:**

1) Some students tell us that they discuss the Cleveland Indians very often with friends and family, while others say they never discuss the Indians at all. How often do you discuss the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)

2) How often do the Cleveland Indians come up during your informal conversations? (7-point scale)

3) How many times in the past year you say that you have talked about the Cleveland Indians? (4-point scale)

4) "The Cleveland Indians come up a lot in my discussions with others." (4-point scale)

5) Compared to other teams, how much time do you spend talking about the Cleveland Indians? (thermometer)

**Thinking:**

1) Students have told us that they have thought a lot about some sports teams but have not thought at all about other teams. How would you rate the amount of thinking you have done about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)

2) Compared to other teams, how often would you say that you think about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)

3) "I think about the Cleveland Indians nearly every week." (4-point scale)
4) During the past year, how often have you thought about the Cleveland Indians? (thermometer scale)

5) Would you say that you think about the Cleveland Indians..... (5-point scale)

**Attitude Extremity**

Four variables were used to reflect attitude extremity. These items measured attitudes toward the Cleveland Indians. Per Bassili (1996), the absolute deviation of the responses from the mid-point of the scale were used to derive an extremity index. These items were:

1), 2), and 3). Participants were asked to circle the number that corresponds to their feelings about the Cleveland Indians on three 7-point bipolar adjective scales. (foolish vs. wise, good vs. bad, and worthless vs. beneficial).

4) Participants rated on an 11-point scale the extent to which they favored or opposed the Cleveland Indians.

**Personal Relevance**

Five variables were used to represent participants attention to relevant information about the Cleveland Indians. They were:

1) Some students tell us that with some sports teams, they pay close attention to relevant information in magazines, newspapers, and on television about the team. With other teams, however, they say they devote little attention to relevant information. How closely do you pay attention to information about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)

2) How interested are you in obtaining information about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)

3) When you keep up with the news by reading magazines, newspapers or by watching television, how closely do you pay attention to stories about the Cleveland Indians? (3-point scale)
4) How important is information about the Cleveland Indians to you? (thermometer scale)

5) "I am very interested in information about the Cleveland Indians." (4-point scale)

**Direct Experience**

Three variables were used to represent the amount of direct experience participants had with the Cleveland Indians. They were:

1) How often have you participated in pre-game activities related to Cleveland Indians' games? (7-point scale)

2) Participants indicated whether they had participated in the following activities: attended, watched or listened to an Indians game, read or talked about the Indians, obtained information about the Indians on TV, or listened to talk radio. The possible range of this variable was 1 to 8.

3) How often have you participated in post-game activities related to the Cleveland Indians games? (7-point scale)

**Attitude Certainty**

Six variables were used to represent attitude certainty. They were:

1) "I am convinced about my opinion of the Cleveland Indians." (4-point scale)

2) Some students have told us that they were very certain of their feelings toward the Cleveland Indians. Others say that they are not certain at all. How certain are you of your feelings about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)

3) How sure are you that you opinion about the Cleveland Indians is right? (3-point scale)

4) How firm would you say your opinion about the Cleveland Indians is? Would you that your opinion could be changed very easily, or would it be difficult to change your opinion? (7-point scale)

5) Some students have very definite views about the Cleveland Indians, while others have difficulty in reaching a decision about the team. Which group would you say that you are more like? (2-point scale)
6) With what degree of certainty do you hold your opinion about the Cleveland Indians? (thermometer scale)

Knowledge

Five variables were used to represent the degree of knowledge. They were:

1) How much information would you say that you have about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)

2) How much knowledge do you have about the Cleveland Indians? (thermometer scale)

3) If you were to list everything that you know about the Cleveland Indians, how long would the list be? (4-point scale)

4) "Compared to other teams, I consider myself to be an expert about the Cleveland Indians." (4-point scale)

5) Some students tell us that they consider themselves to be very knowledgeable about some teams. About other teams, they say they have little or no knowledge. How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)

Affective-Cognitive Consistency

Participants' affective and cognitive scores were obtained from fourteen semantic differential scales. Seven scales measured participants' feelings (affective attachment) and seven scale measured participants' beliefs (cognitive attributions) toward the Cleveland Indians. Per Crites et al., (1994) and Bassili, (1996), an overall affective-cognitive index was derived by computing scores on both components and then calculating the difference score between the affective and cognitive component measures.

The affective component asked participants to rate how they felt about the Cleveland Indians on seven semantic scales as follows: 1) Devoted-Opposed, 2) Awful-Nice, 3) Favorable-Unfavorable, 4) Angry-Happy, 5) Pleasant-Unpleasant, 6) Excited-
Bored, and 7) Disgusting-Acceptable. The cognitive component asked participants to rate their beliefs about the Cleveland Indians on seven semantic scales as follows: 1) Necessary-Unnecessary, 2) Unproductive-Productive, 3) Useless-Useful, 4) Valuable-Worthless, 5) Bad-Good, 6) Weak-Strong, and 7) Winners-Losers.

**Latitude of Rejection**

Two variables were used to represent how participants evaluated his or her attitude against incoming information about the Cleveland Indians. Participants were asked to place an "A" by any statement which was acceptable, and "R" by any statement objectionable and leave blank any statement neither objectionable or acceptable. Per Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif (1957), the number of sentences checked objectionable were used to calculate the size of the region of rejection. The nine questions used and their rank order were:

(5) Some people like the Indians, but don't really care if they win or lose.
(1) The Indian's organization is worthless and a burden on the city of Cleveland.
(7) The Indians are attracting the interest of most high profile agents.
(4) Many people only watch the Indians play because their friends are watching the game.
(9) Of all the professional and collegiate teams that compete in different sports, the Cleveland Indians are the greatest sports team.
(2) When the game is close, you can always count on the Cleveland Indians to choke.
(8) The Indians are home town heroes.
(6) My grandfather and my dad are Indians fans, and so am I.
(3) The Indians trade away their best player.
Behavioral Loyalty Dimension

Nine variables were used to reflect participants behavior related to the Cleveland Indians. All items were assessed using 7-point Likert type scales. They were:

1) I watched a lot of Cleveland Indians' games on TV last season.

2) How often do you wear or display Cleveland Indians team logo items (i.e. T-shirt, sweater, jacket, hat, stickers, etc.) on your clothing, at your place of work, or where you live?

3) I spend considerable time and effort to be more knowledgeable about the Cleveland Indians.

4) Following the Cleveland Indians is a high priority among my leisure activities.

5) I support the idea of increasing my free time to engage in activities (i.e. watching, reading, listening, etc.) to follow the Cleveland Indians.

6) During the baseball season, how closely do you follow the Cleveland Indians using various sport channels on TV, radio, local news, in the newspaper and sport magazines?

7) I would attend more Cleveland Indians' games if I could afford the time and money.

8) Given the choice, I would increase the amount of time I spend following (i.e. watching, reading, attending, etc.) the Cleveland Indians during the baseball season.

9) If I can not attend a Cleveland Indians game in person, I make every effort to watch or listen.

Attitudinal Loyalty Dimension

Eight variables were used to reflect participants commitment to the Cleveland Indians. All items were assessed using 7-point Likert type scales. They were:

1) I would watch a game featuring the Cleveland Indians baseball team regardless of which team they were playing.

2) I am a committed fan of the Cleveland Indians baseball team.
3) I have been a fan of the Cleveland Indians since I began watching professional baseball.

4) I could never feel as passionate and attached to any other professional team as I do the Cleveland Indians.

5) Being a fan of the Cleveland Indians is important to me.

6) It would be unlikely for me to change my allegiance from the Cleveland Indians baseball team to another professional baseball team.

7) How willing are you to defend the Cleveland Indians publicly, even if it causes controversy?

8) It would be difficult for me to be a fan of the Cleveland Indians baseball team.

**Procedures**

**Data Collection: Phase I**

The third week of winter quarter 1998 undergraduate students in two introductory marketing courses (BMKT 650) at The Ohio State University were approached during class and given the 76-item Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey along with a 80-item bank of personality variables (See Appendix H). Class times were 1:30pm - 3:18pm and 5:30pm - 7:18pm. Approval to collect data had been received from Ohio State's Office of Research Protection, committee advisors and cleared with the Business Marketing Department. Business Marketing 650 provides students with the opportunity to volunteer and participate in up to six experiments for one point of extra course credit each. This procedure is outlined in the 650 course syllabus and enables students an opportunity to gain better knowledge of marketing and the research process.

Students were informed as to the nature of the present study and instructed that their participation was voluntary and at any time could decide not to complete the questionnaire. All students present during class were asked to complete the Cleveland
Indians Baseball survey. Any students not in attendance during this class session, were informed by the instructor that they could obtain the questionnaire and turn it in by week four of the quarter. Students were informed that after completion of the survey they could then volunteer for a study to be announced on a sign up sheet located on a bulletin board outside room 237 Hagerty Hall. Students were instructed to sign their name on the study of their choice and show up at the designated time and place.

The questionnaires were distributed during the second half of each class and students had 45 minutes to complete both surveys. Two hundred and seventy seven questionnaires were collected from the afternoon session and eighty four questionnaires were collected from the evening session. Twenty three questionnaires were received from the instructor after week four. The total number of questionnaires collected for the present study in Phase I was $N=384$ (163 females and 221 males). Table 3.4 presents a procedural flow chart for collection of data in the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE I</th>
<th>PHASE II</th>
<th>PHASE III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 3-4</td>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Week 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Message/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 384$</td>
<td>$N = 47$</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2-sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 11-sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4  Procedural Flow Chart for Data Collection
Data Collection: Phase Two

Students who had completed the Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey in Phase One were recruited to participate in an experimental factorial between subject design for extra course credit. An experimental research design was chosen in this study because it allows for a researcher to examine the effect of at least one experimental treatment variable on one or more outcome variable. Experimental research has two unique aspects that distinguish it from other research methodologies. Experimental research attempts to (1) influence a particular variable and (2) when applied appropriately, is the best method for testing hypotheses about cause and effect relationships (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). An experimental design in this study provides the means to not only identify relationships between team loyalty and attitude dimensions but also explores partial determination of what causes these relationships.

The use of a factorial design was chosen to extend the number of relationships that could be examined as well as the examination of the interaction among variables. Factorial designs are an efficient way to study several relationships and their, "greatest virtue lies in the fact that they enable a researcher to study interactions between variables" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; p. 279). The type of research design chosen in this study represents a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design and has been utilized in education and psychology research due to the designs ability to control for internal and external validity issues (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).

Sign up sheets were posted during week four in Hagerty Hall outside room 237. Each sign up sheet contained a brief description of the experiment, an experiment number, date, time and location of the experiment. Students were asked to sign their name under the experiment they had selected and then report at the appropriate time.

Male and female undergraduates (N = 47) participated in two pre-testing session in Phase Two which took approximately 30 minutes. Students reported to a room located
inside Page Hall Library at predetermined times where they were seated individually at tables. Students received a packet entitled Experiment #: HAL-2001 and were instructed to fill out appropriate information (See Appendix I for packet). Written instructions given on the first page informed students that "newspapers and magazines are often given readability index scores," and the study was interested in assessing the validity and favorability of these scores among college student populations. Students were instructed to read three articles taken from various newspapers in the packet of material as they would if they were to encounter it in a magazine or newspaper and that their impressions of the articles would be solicited. The instructions given to participants were intended to prevent them from identifying the nature of the study and answering question in a socially desirable manner.

Students were randomly assigned into groups by distributing the one of two versions of the packet. Randomization of materials for distribution in an experiment is often used in situations where a single package of material for each participant is more convenient and student anonymity is desired (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). On page two, three articles appeared related to the Cleveland Indians that were created from newspaper articles published about the team over the last four years. At the top of page two, a fictitious newspaper logo appeared and the three articles were formatted into three columns. Fictitious head lines and author names were used related to each article.

In version one, (n=23) students were presented with three pro attitudinal articles about the Cleveland Indians. In version two, (n=24) students were presented with three counter attitudinal articles about the Cleveland Indians. The two versions of the message were developed and submitted to a panel of six individuals: two masters students and two doctoral students in Sport Management, and two professional staff members in Recreational Sports knowledgeable about sports and the Cleveland Indians. Each panel member was asked to rate each versions on how positive, negative and credible the articles
appeared. Results from the panel suggested that the articles contained compelling pro
attitudinal and counter attitudinal arguments relating to the respective versions and were
credible. Panel members indicated that the two versions were clearly positive or negative.
Minor changes to wording and format were conducted to refine the articles.

The messages utilized in Phase II were then tested in a pre-testing session. This
procedure required that two messages related to the same topic, object or issue are
developed and given to the sub-sample of the overall undergraduates sample prior to
Phase III. The messages were framed in such a manner that one message contained a set
of statements and arguments that elicited mostly favorable thoughts while the other
message contained a set of statements and arguments that elicited mostly unfavorable
thoughts (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b; Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995). After reading the
articles on page two of the packet, students were asked six questions relating to their
opinions about the articles themselves. Students were asked to not turn back to the
previous page and examine the articles. These questions were measured using 7-point bi-
polar scales labeled at each end. The questions were designed to assess students'
perceptions of how knowledgeable the writers were, how convincing the facts were, the
amount of effort used to read the article, previous level of knowledge relating to the topic
discussed in the articles and a rating of how negative or positive the articles were toward
the Cleveland Indians.

Once the article rating task was completed, students were instructed to complete a
written questionnaire about their attitudes toward the Cleveland Indians. Students were
told that since their opinion about the Cleveland Indians might influence their overall
judgment of the articles, they were asked to complete a scale consisting of 76 identically
formatted measures as in Phase I. This questionnaire was identical to the Cleveland
Indians Baseball Survey given in Phase I except for questions appeared on both sides of
the paper. The pro attitudinal and counter attitudinal messages were designed to
experimentally induce message biasing on the parts of participants. Participants who received the positive message are more likely to rate the team as positive based upon the attributes embedded in the message which should produce higher scores one the second administration of the survey (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).

In contrast, individuals whom received the negative message would be more likely to rate the team as unfavorable and scores should be lower on the second administration of the survey (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). However, the desired effect may be confounded or reversed depending upon the previous strength of an individual's attitude. An individual who has a strong attachment to the Indians may read the negative version and "boomerang" (e.g. Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) thus causing the individual to score higher on measure two. After completing the packet of material, students were debriefed and excused.

Data Collection: Phase III

The data collection process used for Phase III was identical with that of Phase II except for the addition of a control group. One hundred and forty nine (N=149) students in groups of 10 to 17 reported to the same room in Page Library in eleven different experimental sessions conducted over a two day period. In order to keep group sizes small and to accommodate participant's schedules, eleven sessions were offered. Students arrived at predetermined times and were seated individually at tables.

Each student received a packet of material that was identical to those tested in the pre-test except for a third version was included. The three versions used were: a pro attitudinal and counter attitudinal version relating to the Cleveland Indians tested in the pre-test sessions and a version that contained three articles about the Milwaukee Brewers. (See Appendix J for control article) The articles related to the Brewers were included to set up a control group (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). When participants are instructed to
think about the messages, considerable attitude change is expected in the desired direction from the pro attitudinal and counter attitudinal message whereas little to no attitude change is expected from the unrelated message given to the control group (Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995). Participants were randomly assigned one of the three versions. Fifty-five students (n=55) were included in the pro attitudinal group, fifty-two (n=52) in the counter attitudinal group and forty-two (n=42) in the control group. Participants were provided with the same instructions and questions as in Phase II.

The final page of the packet in Phase III contained three sets of cognitive response questions. In order to measure the type of thoughts generated from each version of the message, participants were instructed to complete a questionnaire designed to assess their responses toward the object of the message. Cognitive response and recall of the message were collected by having participants write down all of the thoughts that they could recall going through their minds while they read the articles. Section two asked students to list all of the facts they could recall from the articles. Section three asked students to list all of their thoughts as they answered the survey questions. Lines were provided on the page for responses (See Appendix J). After completion of the material, participants were debriefed and excused.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the participants were analyzed using the SPSS statistical software package and Linear Structural Relations (LISREL 8.0) SIMPLIS (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) program at The Ohio State University to test the four hypotheses. Descriptive statistics were run for each of the ten attitude dimension, two loyalty dimensions, gender, age, and class. Results of descriptive were analyzed and interpreted.

Prior to investigating Hypothesis I through IV, structural equation modeling was used to simultaneously examine the multiple relationships of the ten latent dimensions of
attitude strength, their relationship to loyalty and loyalty's relationship to commitment and behavior toward the Cleveland Indians. A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on data collected from Phase I to test the level of fit for the specified model. A competing models strategy was then incorporated to compare an alternative model to identify and test whether a better fit could be achieved for the hypothetical structural relationships of the ten latent dimension of attitude strength and loyalty.

A measurement model was developed to specify the relationships between the observed variables (i.e. indicators) and the latent variables (i.e. attitude properties, commitment and behavior). A structural model was developed to specify the relationship between the latent variables. A path diagram was constructed to define exogenous and endogenous constructs and link relationships within the path diagram. The path diagram was converted and translated into structural equations to specify the measurement model and to identify correlations of constructs and indicators. The covariance matrix was selected as the input data.

Research and design issues were examined by assessing the adequacy and impact of the sample size and the selection of method of model of estimation. The maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) was used to indicate adequacy of the sample. The computer program SIMPLIS (8.0) was selected to assess the model estimation and identification of the structural model. Results were presented and interpreted to assess the degree to which the data and proposed model meet the assumptions of structural equation modeling. Chi-Square ($\chi^2$) and degrees of freedom, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), goodness-of-fit index and comparative fit index were used to evaluate the overall model, the measurement and structural model and comparison of competing model. Once the best fitting model had been identified, structural equation modeling was conducted on the data collected from Phase II and III.
In order to examine Hypothesis I a series of stepwise multiple regression analysis were conducted to understand the predictive nature of the latent attitude properties on behavior and attitude related to the Cleveland Indians. The results of the analysis, including overall $R$, overall $R^2$, the Adj $R^2$, $\Delta R^2$ at each step, Beta weights, $F$ values and significance levels were presented and interpreted. Assumptions of multiple regression were checked and cross validation procedures were employed to assess internal stability of the calculated regression equation.

In order to examine Hypothesis II and III a multiple discriminant analysis was conducted to investigate the differences between levels of loyalty and the ten latent properties of attitude strength from data collected in Phase I. A tripartite split was performed on the loyalty measure dividing participants into low, moderate and high loyalty groups. The sample from Phase I was randomly divided into an analysis and holdout sample. The analysis sample was used to develop the discriminant function while the holdout sample was used to assess the internal validity of the function. External validity of the discriminant function was assessed by conducting a discriminant analysis on data collected in Phase III.

Group differences in loyalty were analyzed by examining univariate statistics among the ten attitude strength properties. Group means and standard deviations were reported and interpreted. The standardized residuals for each attitude dimension were plotted and interpreted. The equality of group means were tested for each attitude property. The pooled within-group correlation matrix was analyzed and interpreted. The canonical discriminant functions were calculated and interpreted using the Wilks' Lambda, eigenvalues and canonical correlation coefficient to determine the power of the function.

The standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients were analyzed to determine relative importance of each attitude property. The pooled-within-groups correlations were analyzed to determine which attitude property would be used to name
the discriminant function. The group centroids were calculated and interpreted to
determine which of the ten attitude properties were influential and how they discriminated
levels of loyalty. A classification of results summary was conducted to determine the
actual versus predicted group membership and tested for the number of cases classified
correctly. The Tau statistic was calculated and interpreted for improvement in
classification and power.

In order to investigate hypothesis IV, a 2 x 2 x 3(Week 3 vs. Week 8 x High vs.
Low Loyalty x Pro vs. Counter vs. Control Article) completely randomized 1 within and
2 between subjects mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Data
collected in Phase I served as the first measure. The treatment (intervention message) for
the design was created and pre-tested in Phase II. Results of the pre-test were analyzed
and interpreted. Data collected in Phase III served as the second measure. An analysis of
variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the differences in means from time 1 measure and
time 2 measure for each treatment condition and interpreted for each dimension of attitude
strength and loyalty groups.

Cognitive responses and article recall were taken in Phase III. Cognitive responses
were coded into positive, negative, and neutral thoughts by two judges blind to
experimental conditions and subjects loyalty scores. An analysis of variance (ANOVA)
was used to analyze differences in cognitive response related to treatment message and
subjects loyalty. A correlational analysis was conducted to examine the relationship
between valenced thought and within subject attitude change. Article recall was coded
with regard to matching the attributes contained in the articles. Judges agreed on
cognitive response coding in over 85% of the cases and agreed on coding of recall in over
95% of the cases. Disagreements were resolved by discussion.
Limitations and Delimitations

One limitation imposed on the present study was the use of undergraduate students at Ohio State and the selection of the Cleveland Indians as the athletic team. Undergraduate students in Marketing 650 were selected because of their heterogeneous characteristics and their accessibility to recruit into an experimental design and research project. Enrollment in Marketing 650 routinely includes both traditional day-time students, nontraditional night-time students and a large international student population. Although the population would appear to be diverse, their interest in marketing and knowledge of experimental research may lead to higher levels of demand characteristics.

The use of the Cleveland Indians, an American professional franchise and sport, may not have been as relevant to the international students in the sample. Lack of previous knowledge and established attitudes related to the team and the sport may account for a positively skewed distribution. Demographic information related to a students nationality was not taken. The OSU 1996-1997 enrollment statistics reported 3,780 international students enrolled. However, this subgroup may provide insight into the initial reaction, creation and formation of attitudes toward an ambiguous or unknown object in response to a persuasive communication.

The use of the Cleveland Indians as the object of loyalty may have imposed additional constraints due to the geographical location of the team. Enrollment at Ohio State University (48,352) during 1996-1997 consisted of 44,789 students raised in the state of Ohio and may have previously been exposed to information related to the team. The recent success of the Cleveland Indians in the last three years may have influenced opinions about the team.

The time frame used for data collection in the present study involved taking a response in week three and then taking a second response five weeks later. This delimitation was imposed by the logistics of taking two measures on the same population.
Another delimitation in the present study was the method used to measure the accessibility dimension. Response latencies are a more efficient means to measure this dimension (Bassili, 1996; Krosnick et al, 1993). However, access to a computer program designed to measure this aspect of attitude was not available.

A limitation in the present study was the recruitment of participants for Phase III. Characteristics of students who signed up for extra-credit opportunities may differ from those who did not participate. The number of students needed to participate in this phase and the sign up procedure used made it difficult to recruit a representative number of students in each of the non, moderate and high loyalty groups to receive each versions of the message. Thus, the ability to place an equal amount of non, moderate and loyal participants into one of the three experimental conditions was left to chance.

A second limitation to the study was the number of participants needed to achieve predetermined power to examine each of the interaction effects. A sample of 450 would need to be recruited to obtain cell sizes of 50 in loyalty level by version of the message (i.e. 50 high x pro message, 50 moderate x pro message and 50 non x pro message, etc.). Therefore a median split was conducted on the data to form two loyalty groups (i.e. High and Low). The purpose of the intervention was to examine whether changes in attitude dimensions would occur in response to a message but this may be confounded by the students predisposition to the Cleveland Indians. The power in the present study would be diminished to create these interactions but should fall within acceptable limits relating to large effect sizes for experimental studies in the social sciences (Keppel, 1992).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the structural relations among ten latent dimensions of attitude strength and their association with loyalty to an athletic team. Attitude structure was assessed using ten attitude properties. Team loyalty was assessed using both attitudinal and behavioral measures. A second purpose of the study was to examine whether changes in attitude structure could be observed through a persuasive technique to investigate the stability of each attitude dimension. This chapter has been divided into four sections: scale purification, multivariate analysis, message pre-test and experimental phase were discussed.

Study Sample

The original respondent pool (N = 384) was recruited from two introductory marketing courses at The Ohio State University. Of the original sample, five individuals were eliminated due to incomplete surveys in Phase I. The respondent pool for Phase II (n = 47) was recruited from the original sample in Phase I. The respondent pool for Phase III (n = 149) was recruited from the original sample pool as well. Respondents from the original respondent pool were used only once in either Phase II or III.

The final sample of 379 for Phase I included 216 men (57%) and 163 women (43%) with a mean age of 21.43. Of the respondents, 284 (75%) were recruited from an afternoon class held at 1:30pm - 3:00pm and 95 (25%) were recruited from the evening class held at 5:30pm - 7:00pm.
Scale Purification

The Cleveland Indians Baseball survey was purified using a three staged approach to validate the scale's construct validity and reliability. The first stage involved examination of item-to-total correlations to clarify the conceptual framework and sub-scale structure. The second stage utilized feedback provided by subjects to assess the instrument's content and format. The third and final stage employed structural equation modeling to determine whether the hypothesized measurement and structural model were supported by the data. Based upon these results, a valid, reliable and parsimonious scale was developed.

Attitude Dimension Purification

An examination of the item-to-total correlations revealed that items for Personal Relevance and Importance loaded on each dimension at $r = .67$ or above. (See Appendix K). Thus, these items may reflect one dimension. The scale was reexamined to determine if items for these two dimensions measured the same concept. Question #49 for Personal Relevance asked, ("How important is information about the Cleveland Indians to you?"), and loaded on the Personal Relevance dimension at $r = .88$ and the Importance dimension at $r = .91$. This question seems to tap the importance of information which may account for it's high correlation on both dimensions.

The highly interdependent relationship between items on these two dimensions indicated that both dimensions were not be suitable for the present study. In fact, Personal Relevance has been identified as a possible origin of Importance (Boninger, Krosnick & Berent, 1995) and manipulations of Personal Relevance have been used to manipulate Importance (Petty & Krosnick, 1996). Furthermore, Petty, Cacioppo and Haugtvedt (1992) have identified Personal Relevance as a proximal cause of attitude Importance.
The measures and design of the present study may constrain the ability to differentiate between factors which contribute to Personal Relevance and Importance. The strategy adopted for the present study was to drop the dimension of Personal Relevance and subsequent studies should investigate the causal relationship between Personal Relevance and Importance. The decision to retain the Importance dimension was based on two considerations: (1) to understand the value and psychological significance spectators' place in their attitudes toward athletic teams and (2) because of the importance factors link to team identification and social identity theory (Wann & Branscombe, 1990; Branscombe & Wann, 1993).

Based upon subject's feedback and an examination of item-to-total correlations for these two dimensions, two Importance items were eliminated and all five of the Personal Relevance items were eliminated. A common theme that emerged from subjects feedback was that the scale was extremely repetitive. Hence, visual inspection of Importance items revealed that three items (#26, #38, #54) were redundant. The dimension of Personal Relevance was eliminated and the dimension reflecting the psychological significance of the Cleveland Indians for the individual was used. The Importance dimension was now measured with three items (See Appendix L for updated scale).

Further analysis of the item-to-total correlations revealed that all ten Accessibility items loaded at $r = .51$ or higher on six of the nine dimensions (See Appendix K). Although each Accessibility item loaded at $r = .78$ or higher on its own dimension, the numerous cross "loadings" observed on other dimensions suggested problems with the measurement procedure used to assess Accessibility. It was interpreted that the results were artificially created due to design and measurement error used in the present study. Accessibility refers to the response latency between initial exposure of an object and recall of information from memory about an object. The present study attempted to measure Accessibility by asking participants' self-perceptions of the frequency in which they
discussed and thought about the Indians. A more appropriate and reliable method would be to utilize computer or telephone time elapsed measurement techniques (e.g. Bassili, 1996; Fazio, 1986; Fazio & Williams, 1986) to measure Accessibility. Thus, the Accessibility dimension was dropped from the present study.

Each of the items that represented the seven remaining dimensions were reanalyzed to achieve a more parsimonious scale. Item-to-total correlations were examined for these dimensions to identify sub-scale inconsistencies. This examination indicated that all items loaded on their specified dimension and were statistically significant at $\alpha = .01$. Any item which loaded higher on another dimension than its own was checked for conceptual reasons. Intensity item #2, ("Compared to how you feel about other sports team, how strong are your feelings regarding the Cleveland Indians?") loaded higher on Importance $r = .67$ and Direct Experience $r = .61$ than its own dimension $r = .59$. This item was retained because conceptually it represents the intensity of emotion related the a team. An Extremity item #68, measured using an 11-point scale, loaded on five dimensions higher than its own dimension of $r = .55$. This item was retained because conceptually it taps into an individuals absolute deviation in attitude from a neutral point. Furthermore, the item to total correlation correction from $r = .84$ to $r = .55$ may have been influenced from the scaling of responses from the neutral point on an 11-point scale.

Based upon the item-to-total correlations, all items for each dimension were retained. However, an extensive review of scale revealed that some items were redundant. Both a conceptual and applied interpretation were used to eliminate items identified as redundant to make the scale more parsimonious.

The dimension of Latitude of Rejection was left unchanged due the Thurstone scale construction procedure used to develop this measurement and the high reliability and validity obtained from the panel of judges (See Table 3.3). Items for the dimensions of Direct Experience and Extremity also remained unchanged.
Items used to measure the dimensions of Certainty, Intensity, Affective-Cognitive Consistency and Knowledge were deleted to achieve a more parsimonious scale. For the dimension of Certainty, three items were eliminated. Two items for both the Intensity and Knowledge dimensions were deleted. Four items were eliminated from the Affective-Cognitive Consistency dimension. The scale purification procedure yielded an updated scale with eight attitude dimensions measured with 30 items (See Appendix L for updated scale).

**Loyalty Dimensions**

Items used to measure the Behavioral and Commitment dimensions of loyalty were reexamined to achieve a more parsimonious fit. An inspection of the item to total correlations revealed that each item loaded highest on its own dimension at $r = .70$ or higher. A review of the loyalty scale revealed that one behavioral item was redundant and three were inappropriate. For example, behavioral items #37 and #41 asked whether participants followed the Cleveland Indians using newspapers, radio or through other forms of the media. Item #41 was retained because it contained a time component, "During the baseball season...", and was more behavior specific (e.g. Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977).

Behavioral item #21 asked participants if they, "spend considerable time and effort to be more knowledgeable about the Cleveland Indians." Item #21 was not well defined in that it seemed to measure two behavioral aspects: time and effort. The question was deemed misleading and eliminated. Item #51 was eliminated because it did provide a context or time for the behavior to be completed and was not specific (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Behavioral item #66, ("Given the choice, I would increase the amount of time I spend following (i.e. watching, reading attending, etc.) the Cleveland Indians during the baseball season."), reflected a commitment component (i.e. volition) toward the team and
was more appropriate for the attitudinal dimension (e.g. Crosby & Taylor, 1982). As a result, the Behavioral dimension was now measured with five items (See appendix L for updated scale items).

An examination of the Commitment dimension revealed that four items were not appropriate. Items #18, #28 and #43 assumed that respondents had a previous attachment or developed attitude toward the team. For example, item #43, ("It would be unlikely for me to change my allegiance from the Cleveland Indians baseball team to another professional baseball team"), was not relevant for those who did not like the team or who had any previous attachment with the team. Item #30, ("Being a fan of the Cleveland Indians is important to me"), not only assumed that the person was a fan but also tapped into the importance dimension. Hence, items #18, #28, #30 and #43 were deleted from the scale. This procedure yielded a Commitment dimension that was measured with five attitudinal items that more accurately reflected elements of commitment (See Appendix L for updated scale items).

Results of the scale purification generated an updated scale with five items used to measure the Behavioral dimension and five items to measure the Commitment dimension. The updated Cleveland Indians baseball scale contained 40 items: 30 items that measured eight dimension of attitude properties related to the Cleveland Indians and 10 items to measure commitment and behavior toward the Indians. A reliability analysis was conducted on each attitude dimension. Since six of the attitude dimensions were measured with 3-point, 4-point, 7-point, 8-point or 100 point thermometer scales, the standardized item alpha was interpreted (i.e. all items standardized). The dimension of Affective-Cognitive Consistency, Behavior and Commitment were all measured on 7-point scales and hence, not standardized. Results of the reliability analysis and item-to-total correlations are reported in Appendix M.
An analysis of each sub-scale indicated the purified scale was reliable with alphas for each sub-scale ranging from $\alpha's = .77$ to $.96$ with a mean of $.89$. Item-to-total correlation estimates yielded a stable sub-scale structure for all but the dimension of Intensity. Two of the three Intensity items #2 and #27 were unstable. These two items loaded on Direct Experience, Importance and Knowledge higher than their own dimension at .58 and .69 respectively. Although unstable, the conceptual and empirical distinctiveness of the Intensity warranted that these items and the Intensity dimension should be retained and tested with the more rigorous confirmatory analysis procedure. Item #68 for Extremity loaded higher on five other dimensions than its own dimension at $r = .55$. This item was kept for conceptual reasons as detailed in the previous section.

**Structural Equation Modeling**

As a final check on the sub-scale structure and construct validity of the scale, the more rigorous process of covariant structural equation modeling was employed. Joreskog and Sorbom's (1993) Linear Structural Relations (LISREL) VIII was the program selected for this analysis. LISREL uses the maximum likelihood procedure and constrains the factor analysis to an a priori specifications.

LISREL provided a measurement and structural model for the hypothesized relationship between the scale items and the eight attitude and loyalty dimensions. The measurement model specified that twenty one scale items represented eight uncorrelated attitude properties and ten scale items represented to two uncorrelated loyalty dimensions (i.e. Commitment and Behavior) (See Path Diagram, Appendix N). The structural model specified that the eight attitude properties represented a loyalty construct and commitment and behavior represented the same loyalty construct (See Figure 1).
CER = Certainty
DXP = Direct Experience
EXT = Extremity
IMP = Importance
COM = Commitment

INT = Intensity
KNW = Knowledge
AFC = Affective-Cognitive Consistency
LAT = Latitude of Rejection
BEH = Behavior

Figure 1  Structural Model of Fan Loyalty and Squared Multiple Correlations Between Latent Variables
The structural model estimated a series of separate, but interdependent, multiple regression equations simultaneously by specifying the structural model used by the statistical program. The proposed structural relationships were then translated into a series of regression equations for each dependent variable. As indicated in Figure 1, the eight attitude properties were dependent variables and the squared multiple correlations represented the hypothesized relationship between attitude properties and Loyalty.

Inspection of the coefficients of determination revealed that Loyalty accounted for 97% of the variance in Importance, 95% in Intensity, 84% in Knowledge, 82% in Direct Experience, 42% in Extremity, 29% in Certainty, 4% in Affective-Cognitive Consistency, and 6% in Latitude of Rejection. Loyalty in turn becomes a dependent variable that reflected the influence of Commitment 97% and Behavior 95% toward the Cleveland Indians.

The measurement model specified the correspondence between manifest and latent variables. The measurement model allowed for the use of one or more variables for a single independent or dependent concept and then estimated or specified the reliability. The measurement model assessed the contribution of each scale item as well as incorporated how well the scale measured the concept and its reliability into the estimation of the relationship between the eight attitude properties and loyalty.

An examination of parameter estimates and the accompanied t test of significance revealed that all scale items were significant beyond the p < .05 level and in the direction dictated by theory. In addition, all parameter estimates were high in value and above r = .60 (e.g. Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Table 4.1 reports the individual item reliabilities for each attitude property in the form of squared multiple correlations. All of the values range from moderate R² = .41 to high R² = .90 for a mean of R² = .69. The average variance extracted by each dimension was well above the .50 cut-off (e.g. Bagozzi, & Yi, 1988) and ranged from .55 to .81 for a mean of .69. The error variance for Affective-Cognitive
Consistency and Latitude of Rejection were set at 0.0 (e.g. Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) as such the reliabilities were fixed at 1.0 (e.g. Hair et al., 1995) and not reported in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMP1</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP2</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP3</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CER1</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CER2</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CER3</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM1</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM2</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM3</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP4</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP5</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP6</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP7</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP8</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP9</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP10</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Squared Multiple Correlations for Individual Item Reliabilities and Variance Extracted for Measurement Model

A comparison strategy was employed to test the distinctiveness of each attitude dimension against a general attitude model. This strategy involved the assessment of fit for the specified model (i.e. eight latent attitude dimensions dependent upon loyalty which in turn was dependent upon commitment and behavior) with the data collected as compared to the a general attitude model which tests that all attitude scale items reflect one underlying dimension and all loyalty items reflect one dimension. Six indices or measures of fit for both models were then compared to assess the structural and measurement fit of the data to each model. The six indices used were: Chi-Square ($\chi^2$),
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Parsimony Goodness-of-Fit Index (PGFI). Table 4.2 lists the comparisons of Goodness-of-Fit measures for the two models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness-of-fit Measures</th>
<th>Loyalty Model*</th>
<th>General Model**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Fit Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood-ratio Chi-Square/ degrees of freedom</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-Fit index (GFI)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit index (NFI)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit index (CFI)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Goodness-of-Fit Index (PGFI)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Iterations = 22, ** Iterations = 77 (not positive definite) N = 379

Table 4.2 Comparison of Goodness-of-Fit Measures for Specified Model and General Attitude Model

The Loyalty model was identified as the best fit for the data. These results indicated that the eight attitude properties and two loyalty dimensions are distinct and were supported by the data. The ratio of sample size (N=379) to number of free parameters (39) was 9.7:1 which was more than adequate for the analysis. Bentler (1985) recommends a ratio as low as 5:1 but 10:1 may be more appropriate. For the Loyalty model, the likelihood-ratio $\chi^2$ value of 163 with 671.940 degrees of freedom was statistically significant at the .001 significance level. A large $\chi^2$ value relative to the degrees of freedom signifies that the observed and estimated matrices do not differ
considerable (Hair, et al., 1995). When the $\chi^2$ value is divided by the degrees of freedom ($\chi^2$/df), an index is created to assess the level of fit. Values lower than 5.0 (i.e. 5:1 ratio) signify a good fit (e.g. Carmines & McIver, 1981: Wheaton et al., 1977).

The Loyalty model ratio fit of 3.36 indicated that non-significant differences existed between the actual and expected covariance matrices. The general attitude model had a value of 7.25 which signifies it did not achieve an adequate fit for the data. The $\chi^2$ measure has been found to be sensitive to both small and large sample sizes and when the sample is outside the range of 100 to 200 other measures should be used to complement the fit assessment (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988: Bollen, 1989; Hair et al., 1995).

The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) represents the goodness-of-fit that could be expected if the model were estimated in the population, not just the sample drawn for the estimation. With a sample size of 379, a tendency to overfit the model should be analyzed. The RMSEA attempts to correct for large sample size and the loyalty model's RMSEA value of .08 is within the acceptable range of .05 and .08 for "adequate fit" (Hair et al., 1995) as compared to the attitude model's RMSEA of .13.

The goodness-of-fit index (GFI) measures the relative amount of the variances and covariance's in the sample covariance that are predicted by the reconstructed covariance matrix based upon a specific set of parameters (Bollen, 1989). The GFI ranges in value from 0.0 (poor fit) to 1.0 (perfect fit) (Hair et al., 1995). The loyalty model's GFI of .78 indicated that its set of parameters provided a closer fit between the sample and predicted covariance matrices than the general attitude model's GFI of .70.

The normed fit index (NFI) and the comparative fit index (CFI) can also be used to compare the loyalty model and the general attitude model (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993). The NFI has been a popular measure to assess the fit of data to a model (Bentler & Bonett, 1980). Values for the NFI and CFI range between 0.0 and 1.0 with values close to 1.0 indicate perfect fit (Bollen, 1989; Hair et al., 1995). The loyalty model had a NFI
of .88 and CFI of .91 as compared to the general attitude model's NFI of .70 and CFI of .78. This indicated that the hypothesized model fits the data adequately and considerably better than the general attitude model.

The parsimony goodness of fit index (PGFI) for the loyalty model was estimated against the general attitude model. The PGFI indicates the parsimony of the estimated model regardless of degrees of freedom. Values close to 1.0 indicate greater model parsimony (Hair et al., 1995). The loyalty model had a PGFI of .67 while the general attitude model's PGFI was .56 that indicated the loyalty model was more parsimonious.

Bentler and Bonett (1980) suggest an additional measure of fit, the incremental fit index, for which values of approximately .90 or greater indicate excellent fit. This index indicated that the loyalty model fits the present data adequately (p = .91). An inspection of the residuals for each parameter in the hypothesized model indicated that all the residuals were near zero which suggest an adequate fit for the data (Bollen, 1989). Based upon the goodness-of-fit measures, the loyalty model achieved an "adequate" to "close" fit for the data. These results indicated that measurement and the structural model were supported by the data and provided initial evidence of the hypothesized relationship between attitude properties and loyalty. Furthermore, the general attitude model was "positive definite" which produced results that should interpreted with care.

A subsequent analysis was conducted isolating the loyalty items to examine the multidimensional perspective of the loyalty dimension. An examination of several goodness-of-fit measures for the loyalty items indicated that the specified model of two loyalty dimension achieved a better fit than a single loyalty construct. Goodness-of-fit measures are provided in Table 4.3. An inspection of Table 4.3 indicated that for five of the six fit measure, the multidimensional model of loyalty was found to provide a better fit for the data. Although the PGFI index was the same for both models (.60), this indicated that parsimony was not lost by measuring loyalty via two dimensions.
The results of the scale purification yielded an updated scale with 30 items which represented eight latent dimensions of attitude strength, five items to measure commitment, and five items to measure behavior toward the Cleveland Indians baseball team. The sub-scale structure was confirmed through item to total correlation and LISREL’s confirmatory factor analysis. The internal consistency estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) for the sub-scales were all within the acceptable minimum suggested by Nunnally (1978) of .80. The content of the scale was meaningful and reflective of the eight dimensions of attitude strength and two dimensions of loyalty. These results indicated a reasonable fit between the model and the data.

These results provided the initial framework for a measurement and structural model of fan loyalty from which subsequent investigations can now proceed. The utility of the present model supported the distinctiveness of the eight attitude properties, their relationship to loyalty and subsequently their relationship to commitment and behavior. These relationships can now be examined through the use of raw data. Composite scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness-of-fit Measures</th>
<th>Specified Model</th>
<th>Single Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolute Fit Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood-ratio Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/degrees of freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-Fit index (GFI)</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit index (NFI)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit index (CFI)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Goodness-of-Fit Index (PGFI)</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Iterations = 6 N = 379

Table 4.3 Comparison of Goodness-of-Fit Measures for the Specified and Single Loyalty Model
instead of standardized latent factor scores can now be calculated from each sub-scale to investigate each hypotheses under investigation in the present study.

HYPOTHESIS ONE:
Properties of attitude strength can be used to predict behavioral and attitudinal differences in an individual's loyalty toward an athletic team.

Two multiple regressions were conducted to predict the behavior and commitment of subjects to the Cleveland Indians Baseball team from eight distinct attitude properties. The two dependent variables and eight independent variables were calculated from mean responses to scale items on the Cleveland Indians Baseball survey. The eight independent variables were IMPORT, INTENS, KNOWL, CERTAIN, DIREXP, LATREJ, AFFCOG, and EXTREM. The two dependent variables were COMMIT and BEHAV.

The Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey was administered to 379 Ohio State Students. All 379 students provided complete responses, resulting in 379 observation available for the analysis. Two regression analyzes were used to estimate the relationship between the eight independent attitude factors and two loyalty dimensions. An overall stepwise regression was conducted for each dependent variable using the entire sample. Conservative estimates for the ratio of responses to independent variable in stepwise regression are 40:1 (Hair et al., 1995) and 50:1 (Stevens, 1992). The current study has a ratio 47:1 which indicated an acceptable number of observations in relationship to the number of independent variables under investigation to conduct the regression analysis.

Data Evaluation
Stepwise regression was employed to select variables for inclusion in the regression variates. Stepwise was chosen for the analysis because the research goal was primarily predictive (Hair et al., 1995, Stevens, 1992). This approach examined the
contribution of each predictor variable to the regression model. Each predictor variable is considered for inclusion prior to developing the equation.

The means and standard deviation for the independent and dependent variables are presented in table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFCOG</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTAIN</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIREXP</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREM</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENS</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWL</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATREJ</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAV</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 379

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics for Eight Attitude Predictors and Two Loyalty Variables

An inspection of the means and standard deviations revealed no problems with the composite variables. Table 4.5 displays the correlations among the eight independent variables and their correlations with the dependent variables. An examination of the correlation matrix indicated that considerable levels of association exist among some of the attitude predictors. The predictor IMPORT was most closely correlated with BEHAV (r = .86) and COMMIT (r = .89). The predictor DIREXP had a high level of association with BEHAV (r = .85) and COMMIT (r = .82).
The first step in building the regression models was to select the best predictor(s). Based upon the correlation matrix, IMPORT and DIREXP should be among the first selected. It should be noted that although variables IMPORT (\(r = .86\)) and DIREXP (\(r = .85\)) are almost equally correlated with BEHAV, they are not as highly correlated with each other (\(r = .74\)) as they are with each dependent variable. This suggested that the use of both IMPORT and DIREXP were appropriate and that each variable represented different information which pertained to a subject's loyalty toward the Indians.

The statistics of the full regression model for COMMIT are presented in Table 4.6. The first hypothesis tested within multiple regression was that the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the linear combination of the independent variables is zero (i.e. \(H_0: R^2 = 0\)). An examination of the analysis of variance indicated that the linear equation was significant at \(F = .001\), hence, \(H_0\) was rejected. Examination of the full model indicated that the magnitude of the relationship between the observed values for COMMIT and the predicted values of COMMIT was \(R = .92\).
Table 4.6 Regression of COMMIT on AFFCOG, CERTAIN, DIREXP, EXTREM, IMPORT, INTENS, KNOWL and LATREJ. (Stepwise Regression)

An examination of the $R^2$ value indicated that 84% ($R^2 = .84$) of the variance in COMMIT was explained by a linear combination of IMPORT, DIREXP, and AFFCOG. The three predictor variables were statistically significant at $p < .001$. The standard error of .752 indicated that the cases used to calculate the regression equation were normally distributed and accurate in predicting COMMIT from the linear combination of IMPORT, DIREXP and AFFCOG.

$R^2$ and standard error indicate the "goodness of fit" measures of the linear regression model and how powerful the regression model was in explaining COMMIT for the data. The regression model calculated for COMMIT fits the data well and was powerful. Furthermore, the proportion of variance in COMMIT not explained (i.e. residual variance) by the linear combination of the three predictor variables in the full model was only 16%.

As expected from the correlation matrix, the predictor variable IMPORT was entered into the equation first and accounted for 80% of the variance in COMMIT. The changes in $R^2$ for DIREXP ($R^2$ change = 3.7%) and AFFCOG ($R^2$ change = .5%) although small are statistically significant in explaining additional variance in COMMIT at each step of the analysis.
The second hypothesis tested in multiple regression was that in the population, the partial regression coefficient for a particular independent variable was zero when the other independent variables were held constant (i.e. Bk = 0). An inspection of t-values and their significance found all partial regression coefficients significant at the p < .01 level. Hence, this hypothesis was rejected and indicated that the independent variable with which the partial regression coefficient was associated contributes significantly to the regression when holding other independent variables constant.

An examination of the Beta's (β) for COMMIT indicated that IMPORT (β = .89) was positively related to COMMIT and was the most influential predictor of commitment toward the Cleveland Indians. The Beta coefficients for DIREXP (β = .31) and AFFCOG (β = -.07) indicated that DIREXP was positively related to COMMIT and the second most influential predictor. The sign associated with the AFFCOG predictor indicated a negative association with COMMIT. Smaller values for AFFCOG indicated more consistency between one's feeling and beliefs about the Indians.

The statistics for the full regression model of BEHAV are presented in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F(Eqn)</th>
<th>SigF</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>1076.572</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>In:</td>
<td>IMPORT</td>
<td>.8606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>823.667</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>In:</td>
<td>DIREXP</td>
<td>.4421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>604.581</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>In:</td>
<td>KNOWL</td>
<td>.2105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>466.792</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>In:</td>
<td>AFFCOG</td>
<td>-.0696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pin = .01
SigF at .01
N = 379
Adjusted R² = .83
Standard Error = .718

Table 4.7 Regression of BEHAV on AFFCOG, CERTAIN, DIREXP, EXTREM, IMPORT, INTENS, KNOWL and LATREJ. (Stepwise Regression)
An examination of $R$ in the full model indicated that the magnitude of the relationship between the observed values for BEHAV and the predicted values of BEHAV was $R = .91$. An examination of the $R^2$ value indicated that 83% ($R^2 = .83$) of the variance in BEHAV was explained by a linear combination of IMPORT, DIREXP, KNOWL and AFFCOG. The four predictor variables were statistically significant at $p < .001$. The standard error of .718 indicated that the cases were normally distributed and accurate in predicting BEHAV from the linear combination of IMPORT, DIREXP, KNOWL and AFFCOG. The regression model calculated for BEHAV fits the data well and was powerful. The proportion of variance in BEHAV not explained (i.e. residual variance) by the linear combination of the three predictor variables in the full model was only 17%.

As expected from the correlation matrix, the predictor variable IMPORT was entered into the equation first and accounted for 74% ($R^2 = .74$) of the variance in BEHAV. The variable DIREXP contributed an additional 7.4% ($R^2$ change = .074) to explained variance in BEHAV toward the team. The changes in $R^2$ for KNOWL (1%) and AFFCOG (.4%) although small were statistically significant in explaining the additional variance in BEHAV at each step of the analysis.

An examination of the Beta's for the BEHAV model indicated that IMPORT ($\beta = .86$) was positively related to BEHAV and was the most influential predictor of behavior toward the Cleveland Indians. The Beta coefficients for DIREXP ($\beta = .44$) and KNOWL ($\beta = .21$) were positive and represented the second and third most influential predictors for BEHAV. The Beta of AFFCOG ($\beta = -.07$) indicated a negative association with behavior toward the team.
Assumptions of Multiple Regression

The assumptions of multiple regression were examined to ensure both that the results obtained were truly representative of the sample and that best possible results were obtained (Hair et al., 1996). An examination of the histogram of residuals, normal probability plot, scatter plot and partial regression plots indicated that residuals did not deviate from a normal distribution, were constant in variance and were not correlated with the independent variables. Residual statistics provided in the SPSS output indicated that the mean of the residuals for both COMMIT and BEHAV were zero. The Durbin-Watson test indicated no auto-correlation was present (COMMIT = 2.05; BEHAV = 2.03). These results indicated that all assumptions for multiple regression were meet and the regression models were appropriate.

The extent of collinearity was assessed through examination of the Tolerance and VIF statistics. Tolerance levels for the three predictor variables of COMMIT and four predictors BEHAV ranged from .29 to .95 well above the .19 threshold for multicollinearity concerns (Hair et al., 1995). The VIF statistics for the predictor variables ranged from 1.1 to 3.2 well below the VIF cutoff of 5.3 (Hair et al., 1995). Furthermore, the collinearity diagnostics examined indicated that the predictor variables were not cross loading on more than one variable and collinearity was not present. These results demonstrated that none of the independent variables extracted for both regression models were linear combinations of the other independent variables.

Cross Validation

The overall sample was randomly split in two groups to test the internal stability of the regression equation calculated for COMMIT and BEHAV. The primary concern of this procedure was to ensure that the results are generalizable to the population and not specific to the sample used to estimate the regression equations. A regression model was
estimated for two samples and then the results were compared. Results of cross validation for COMMIT are presented in Table 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Component</th>
<th>Overall (N = 379)</th>
<th>Sample 1 (N = 207)</th>
<th>Sample 2 (N = 172)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression coefficient</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta coefficient</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>13.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIREXP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression coefficient</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta coefficient</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>Not Entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Coefficient</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>-3.42</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 Split Sample Validation of the Stepwise Estimation for Commitment

Table 4.8 contains the overall stepwise results (N = 379) plus the results from stepwise models estimated for two sub-samples (n = 207) and (n = 197). Comparison of the overall model fit demonstrated a high level of similarity for the results in terms of R², adjusted R² and the standard error of the estimate. However, when comparing the individual coefficients for all three models, one difference emerged. In sample 2, AFFCOG did not enter in the stepwise results as it did in sample one and the overall sample. The omission of AFFCOG in one of the sub-samples suggested that it was a
marginal predictor. This was also indicated by the low Beta ($\beta = -0.077$) and $t$ value ($t = -2.83$) in the overall model.

A second cross validation procedure was used for BEHAV. Two samples were randomly selected to test the BEHAV regression model. Results for the BEHAV model are presented in Table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Component</th>
<th>Overall ($N = 379$)</th>
<th>Sample 1 ($N = 185$)</th>
<th>Sample 2 ($N = 194$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression coefficient</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta coefficient</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIREXP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression coefficient</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta coefficient</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Coefficient</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>Not Entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Coefficient</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9  Split Sample Validation of the Stepwise Estimation for Behavior

Table 4.9 contains the overall stepwise results ($N = 379$) for BEHAV plus results from stepwise models estimated for two sub-samples ($n = 185$) and ($n = 194$).
comparison of the overall model fit demonstrated a high level of similarity of the results in terms of $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$ and the standard error of the estimate. However, when comparing the individual coefficients for all three models, one difference emerged. In sample 2, AFFCOG did not enter in the stepwise results as it did in sample one and the overall sample. The omission of AFFCOG in one of the sub-samples suggested that it was a marginal predictor. This was also indicated by the low Beta ($\beta = -.070$) and $t$ value ($t = -3.16$) for AFFCOG in the overall model.

Based upon calculations contained in Cohen and Cohen (1983), a regression equation based upon approximately 175 observations with seven independent variables requires a $R^2$ value of at least 14% of the variance explained for the relationship to be deemed statistically significant with a power of $1 - \beta = .80$ if the significant level is set at $p < .01$. The ratio of independent variables to subjects (1:21 and 1:25) also meets Stevens' (1992) proposed guideline of 15 subjects per independent variable for a reliable regression equation in the social sciences. Thus, the procedure of splitting the overall sample into two groups to test the internal stability of the regression equation yielded $R^2$ values that were more than adequate for significance at $p < .01$.

The regression model estimated for COMMIT which utilized the predictors of IMPORT and DIREXP was deemed as internally stable and generalizable to the population. The regression model for BEHAV which utilized the predictors of IMPORT, DIREXP and KNOWL was deemed as internally stable and generalizable to the population. The predictor AFFCOG was found to be a marginal predictor in both regression models and its use may not be appropriate when generalizing to the population.

HYPOTHESIS TWO:

Significant differences are expected in structural composition of the eight latent attitude dimensions between high, moderate and low allegiant individuals.
A multiple discriminant analysis was conducted to investigate whether differences existed between the means for the eight independent attitude variables based upon three levels of loyalty. Discriminant analysis was employed to simultaneously study the differences between the three groups with respect to the eight independent variables. The present study examined three groups: high, moderate and non loyal individuals. Stevens (1992) suggested that 20 cases are needed for each discriminating variable for reliable results. Reliable results demonstrate confidence that the discriminating variables selected as most important in interpretation of the discriminate function would again be identified in another independent sample from the same population. The present study had a ratio of 47 cases for each discriminating variable (47:1).

Multiple discriminant analysis was utilized in the present study to compare the level of individuals' loyalty to the Cleveland Indians in terms of eight attitude dimensions. A tripartite split was conducted on loyalty scores from Phase I (N = 379) and all participants were placed into one of three groups as described in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Non loyal scores ranged from 1.00 to 1.74 (n = 129)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Moderate loyal scores ranged from 1.75 to 3.75 (n = 123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>High loyal scores ranged from 3.76 to 7.0 (n = 127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Tripartite Split on Loyalty Measures to Create High, Moderate and Low Loyalty Groups
Loyalty scores were calculated from responses on the five commitment and five behavior items which created a composite loyalty score. The tripartite split placed \( n = 129 \) subjects in the non loyal group, \( n = 123 \) subjects in the moderate loyal group and \( n = 127 \) in the high loyalty group. Of interest in the present study was to examine whether individuals in each loyalty group differed significantly on attitude properties from one another and if they did, what was the nature of the differences. Three questions were asked and researched in the discriminant analysis procedure:

1. How well is one able to "discriminate" between levels of loyalty on the basis of eight attitude dimensions?
2. How well do the eight attitude dimensions discriminate level of loyalty?
3. What attitude dimensions are the most powerful discriminators of loyalty?

The group variable in the analysis was loyalty divided into three groups: non loyal, moderate loyal and high loyal. The discriminating variables were AFFCOG, CERTAIN, DIREXP, EXTREM, IMPORT, INTENS, KNOWL and LATREJ. Group differences were initially examined with univariate statistics. An univariate \( F \)-ratio analysis was performed on the data collected with 2 and 376 degrees of freedom. A significance test was calculated for each attitude property and reported in Table 4.11.

An inspection of Table 4.11 indicated that the three groups differed significantly at \( F(2,273), p < .01 \) on all of the eight attitude dimensions. The group means and standard deviations calculated are presented in Table 4.12. An inspection of the group means for the eight discriminating variables indicated that the three groups differed in their attitude toward the Cleveland Indians.
Variable | F  | Significance |
--- | --- | --- |
AFFCOG | 9.62 | .0001 |
CERTAIN | 46.40 | .0000 |
DIREXP | 307.07 | .0000 |
EXTREM | 73.42 | .0000 |
IMPORT | 516.25 | .0000 |
INTENS | 256.60 | .0000 |
KNOWL | 185.56 | .0000 |
LATREJ | 5.83 | .0032 |

Table 4.11  Univariate F Test with 2 and 376 Degrees of Freedom for Discriminant Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discriminating Variables</th>
<th>Group Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non (n = 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFCOG</td>
<td>4.88 (5.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTAIN</td>
<td>19.02 (14.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIREXP</td>
<td>1.68 (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREM</td>
<td>2.08 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT</td>
<td>4.96 (5.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENS</td>
<td>7.45 (8.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWL</td>
<td>6.96 (7.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATREJ</td>
<td>2.48 (1.67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 379
SD are reported in ( )
All means significantly differed at F(2, 376), p < .01

Table 4.12  Means and Standard Deviations for Discriminant Variables
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The univariate analysis indicated that the mean scores for all eight of the attitude dimension for individuals in the high, moderate and non loyalty groups significantly differed in the appropriate direction at $F(2,376)$, $p < .01$. The means for the dimensions of INTENS, KNOWL, IMPORT, DIREXP and LATREJ increased with the level of loyalty. This indicated that as the level of loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians increased, so did scores on these six attitude dimensions.

The dimension of EXTREM was scaled to reflect the deviation from a neutral point. Thus, higher scores were observed for the high ($M = 3.27$) and non ($M = 2.08$) loyalty groups than the moderate ($M = 2.02$) group. The dimension of CERTAIN reflected differences between the high and non loyal groups and the moderate group. High ($M = 29.25$) and non ($M = 19.02$) loyal individuals were more certain of their attitude than moderately ($M = 16.85$) loyal individuals. The means for the AFFCOG dimension decreased with the level of loyalty; non loyalty ($M = 4.88$), moderate loyalty ($M = 4.44$) and high loyalty ($M = 2.94$) and indicated more consistency between feelings and attitudes toward the team.

The results of the univariate $F$ test supported Hypothesis Two. Significant differences were observed in the structure of attitude dimensions for high, moderate and low allegiant individuals. Research question one for discriminant analysis was also answered. An individual's level of loyalty toward the Indians was differentiated by scores on the eight attitude dimensions.

HYPOTHESIS THREE:
The psychological significance and value a fan places in their attitude toward an athletic team will be the most influential attitude property to identify level of loyalty.

A technical difficulty emerged through the use of the univariate analysis to describe group differences. The univariate analysis considered each attitude dimension individually,
and did not examine all eight dimensions simultaneously. Group differences tend to increase as correlations among the variables become larger. With the univariate analysis, it was not possible to determine the relative importance of the eight attitude dimensions. Consequently, no assessment was made as to relative importance without regard for the intercorrelations between the dimensions.

Since the interdependence (i.e. intercorrelations) among the attitude dimensions affects the analysis, the pooled within-group correlation matrix was examined. This matrix was obtained by averaging separate covariance matrices. The pooled within-group matrix is presented in Table 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFCOG</th>
<th>CERTAIN</th>
<th>DIREXP</th>
<th>EXTREM</th>
<th>IMPORT</th>
<th>INTENS</th>
<th>KNOWL</th>
<th>LATREJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFCOG</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTAIN</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIREXP</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREM</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENS</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWL</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATREJ</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 379

Table 4.13  Pooled Within-Groups Correlation Matrix. Intercorrelations Among Discriminant Variables

An inspection of the pooled within-groups correlation matrix indicated that the eight discriminating variables were not highly related. IMPORT and INTENS yielded the highest correlation $r = .56$. DIREXP and KNOWL were correlated at $r = .54$. This indicated that multicollinearity was not a problem when the discriminant function was calculated. However, the pooled within-groups correlation matrix still represents a
bivariate correlation and does not take into consideration the interrelations of the variables. In essence, it ignored the influence of other variables when calculating the Person r correlation.

In discriminant analysis, the emphasis was to analyze the variables simultaneously to construct a linear combination that would maximally differentiate among the three groups. A linear discriminant equation was calculated for the data which contained information about all eight discriminant variables into a single index (i.e. discriminate score). A single composite discriminate score was derived for each individual that factored in the intercorrelations among the eight dimensions. The discriminate scores for all individuals within a particular loyalty group were then averaged to arrive at a group mean refereed to as a "centroid". The two discriminant functions, group centroids, standardized discriminant function coefficients, within-groups structure coefficients, canonical correlation coefficients, eigenvalues, and Wilks' Lambda are presented in Table 4.14.

The next step in the analysis was to tests which of the discriminant functions were statistically significant. The general statistical (null) hypothesis was that all the group centroids (i.e. means for the three loyalty groups) for the two discriminant functions were equal. Since two discriminant functions were derived, a two-stage hypothesis testing process was conducted to exclude one discriminate function at a time. The first statistical hypothesis tested two hypothesis simultaneously.

**HO1:** In the populations from which the samples are drawn the mean scores for high, moderate and low loyalty conditions (group centroids) of all the discriminant functions in all groups are equal.

**HO1a:** low loyal (1) = moderate loyal (1) = high loyal (1)

**HO1b:** low loyal (2) = moderate loyal (2) = high loyal (2)
The second statistical hypothesis was tested when discriminant function 1 had been rejected.

**H02:** In the population form which the samples are drawn the mean scores on for high, moderate and low loyalty conditions (group centroids) of discriminant function 2 in all groups are equal.

**H02a:** low centroid (2) = moderate centroid (2) = high centroid (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Group Centroids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFCOG</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTAIN</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIREXP</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREM</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENS</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWL</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATREJ</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function 1</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function 2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*b* = standardized discriminant function coefficient  
*s* = within-groups structure coefficient  
*Rc* = canonical correlation coefficient

Table 4.14 Multiple Discriminant Analysis Results for Discriminant Functions, Group Centroids, Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients, Within-Groups Structure Coefficients, Canonical Correlation Coefficients, and Eigenvalues

The Wilks' Lambda and the \( \chi^2 \) statistics were calculated to test HO1 and HO2.

The first statistical hypothesis HO1 was rejected. Discriminant function 1 was statistically
significant \( \chi^2 = 583.173, df = 16, p < .001 \) which indicated that means (group centroids) for the three groups were not equal. This indicated that the mean scores for each of the eight attitude dimensions were statistically different for individuals in the non, moderate and low loyalty groups. The Wilks' Lambda value of (.21) indicated that 21% of the variance in discriminant score 1 and 2 were not explained by the group loyalty variable. Furthermore, discriminant score 1 and 2 explained 79% of the variance in differences within group loyalty.

The second statistical hypothesis H02 was rejected \( \chi^2 = 29.836, df = 16, p < .001 \). Although discriminant score 2 was statistically significant, the Wilks' Lambda value (.92) suggested that function 2 provided a small amount of discrimination among the group centroids (i.e. 8% of variance explained). Function 2 although significant, added only 2.38% of explained variance to function1 and was marginal in discriminating levels of loyalty among the eight attitude dimensions.

The discriminating power for function 1 and function 2 was assessed through an examination of eigenvalues and canonical correlations presented in Table 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Function</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 through 2</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>583.173</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>29.836</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alpha = .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fcn</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>97.62</td>
<td>97.62</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15  Canonical Discriminant Functions and Eigenvalues
Discriminant function 1 had an eigenvalue of 3.42, while discriminate function 2 had an eigenvalue of less than .083. Discriminant function 1 was more powerful in distinguishing among the three loyalty groups while discriminate function 2 had limited power. Function 1 explained 98% of the variance in the group loyalty variable as opposed to 2% by function 2. Function 1 had a canonical correlation coefficient of .88 (Rc = .88) which further demonstrated that discriminate function 1 was relatively more powerful in discriminating the three groups of loyalty. Function 2 had a Rc value of .28 (Rc = .28) which made it relatively less powerful.

For each discriminate function, the canonical correlation coefficient squared (i.e. \( Rc^2 \)) calculated represented the proportion of variance in the discriminate score that was explained by the group loyalty variable. Therefore, discriminant function 1 explained 77% (\( Rc^2 = .77 \)) of the variance in the discriminate score that can be explained by the group loyalty variable as compared to 7% (\( Rc^2 = .07 \)) for function 2. The proportion of variance not explained by the group loyalty variable was calculated by subtracting \( Rc^2 \) from 1.0. The group loyalty variable did not explain 23% of the variance in the discriminate score for function 1 as compared to 93% in function 2.

In addition to eigenvalues and canonical correlation coefficients, the classification of cases provides an index of the effectiveness and discriminating power of the two discriminant functions. This procedure predicted group membership for individual cases of "unknown" membership (i.e. classify individuals' loyalty based upon scores on the attitude dimensions). Classification results are presented in Table 4.16.

The classification of cases procedure demonstrated that the two discriminant functions placed 80% of the cases into their appropriate loyalty group. If cases were randomly assigned to the three loyalty groups, the prior probability was approximately 33%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Predicted Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non Mod High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Loyalty</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>108 18 3</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Loyalty</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>30 80 13</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Loyalty</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0 13 114</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of cases correctly classified: 80%

Table 4.16 Results for Classification of Cases

The actual prior probabilities for classification were Non Loyalty = .34, Moderate Loyalty = .32 and High Loyalty = .34. The number of cases that could be classified correctly by random assignment was 124 (i.e. .34(129) + .32(123) + .34(127) = 124). The percent of cases classified correctly by random assignment was 33% (i.e. 124/379).

The percent of cases classified correctly with the two discriminate functions was 80% which was 47% higher than the percent classified correctly by random assignment (i.e. 33%). The improvement in the percent of cases classified correctly of 47% indicated that the two discriminate functions were powerful in discriminating the three groups of loyalty. It should be noted that the classification of cases using the discriminate functions were based upon both discriminant functions. However, as previously indicated, discriminate function 1 was the primary function which distinguished the three groups of loyalty.

An inspection of the classification Table 4.16 indicated that the discriminate functions were the most effective in correctly classifying individuals into the high loyalty.
group (90%) and non loyalty group (84%). Although the discriminate functions classified the moderately loyal group correctly 65% of the time, 24% of the cases from the moderately loyal group were classified incorrectly into the low group and 11% were classified incorrectly into the high loyalty group. Furthermore, 14% of non loyal cases were classified incorrectly into the moderate group. For the entire sample of cases, 77 out of 379 cases or 20% were classified incorrectly. In order to analyze the reduction in error that was gained through the use of discriminate functions, the Tau-Proportional reduction in error statistic was calculated.

The Tau statistic indicated the percent of fewer classification errors through the use of discriminant functions compared to the expected percent of cases incorrectly classified by random assignment. The calculated value of Tau was .695 and indicated that 70% fewer errors of classification occurred when cases were classified using the discriminate functions compared to classification by random assignment. This resulted in a 37% increase of predictive ability.

As described previously, three group centroids were calculated (See Table 4.14). An inspection of Table 4.14 demonstrates that the group centroids differed for discriminate function 1: Non loyalty centroid = -1.86. Moderate loyalty centroid = -.62 and High loyalty centroid = 2.49. The difference between centroids indicated that the higher an individual's loyalty to the Indians, the higher his or her discriminate score 1. Conversely, the lower an individual's loyalty, the lower his or her discriminate score 1. Since discriminate scores have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.0, standard deviation units were used to analyze the magnitude of the difference between the group centroids. It should be noted that for discriminate score 1, the non loyalty group centroid was more than one standard deviation units lower than the moderate loyalty centroid. The moderate loyal centroid was almost three standard deviations lower than the high
loyalty centroid. These results indicated that discriminant function 1 separated (i.e. discriminated) the three groups from each other.

When discriminant function 2 was considered, group centroids for the most loyal and least loyal were similar (i.e. approximately 0.16 of a standard deviation separated the two groups). Therefore, although discriminant function 2 was statistically significant, it did not differentiate non loyal from high loyal individuals. The moderately loyal centroid differed from both high and non loyal centroids and was approximately 0.5 of a standard deviation unit. This indicated that the centroids for the three groups only slightly differed and that discriminant function 2 separated the moderately loyal individuals from non and high allegiant individuals.

These results provided the answer to research question 2. The set of variables effectively in distinguished between levels of loyalty for individuals in the sample. A classification success rate of 80% provided further support for their use in understanding the nature of the differences in loyalty among individuals. The relative importance of each discriminant variables (i.e. attitude property) was determined by the standardized discriminate function coefficients (weights) and structure coefficients (See Table 4.17).

Discriminant variables with standardized discriminate function coefficients equal to or higher than one-half the highest coefficient for a discriminant function was the criterion utilized to determine relative influence (Hair et al., 1995; Stevens, 1992). Based upon this criterion, clearly the most important variables that differentiate among the three groups of loyalty were IMPORT (.70) and DIREXP (.43). When the eight attitude dimensions were considered simultaneously, AFFCOG (-.12), CERTAIN (-.07), EXTREM (-.09), INTENS (.12), KNOWL (.05), and LATREJ (-.10) were considered redundant of the two most influential attitude dimensions IMPORT and DIREXP.
Table 4.17 Standardized Coefficients and Pooled Within-Groups Correlation for Discriminant Variables

The standardized discriminant coefficients for function 1 indicated that importance and direct experience were the most effective attitude properties that distinguished loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians. The sign of the standardized discriminant function coefficient indicated that the three groups differed on these two attitude properties in a positive direction. This indicated that high loyal individuals possessed attitudes toward the Indians that contained higher levels of importance and direct experience than moderate and non loyal cases. The same pattern was found for differences between moderate and non loyal cases.

The canonical discrimination function coefficients provided a more accurate description of how the groups differed on each attitude property with regards to the intercorrelations among these properties. The standardized function coefficients for function 2 indicated that moderately loyal fans differed from high and non loyal fans on CERTAIN and EXTREM attitude properties. This indicated that high and low loyal groups were more certain and extreme in their attitudes than the moderately loyal group.

The structure coefficient provided information as to the type of information each discriminate function carried. For discriminant function 1, attitude dimensions that loaded
higher than the .30 criterion (e.g. Hair et al., 1995) were: IMPORT (.90), DIREXP (.69), INTENS (.63), KNOWL (.54), and EXTREM (.32). Higher scores on discriminate function 1 represented higher values on each of these attitude properties. Function 2 carried information related to CERTAIN (.74) and EXTREM (.68) (See Table 4.17).

The discriminating variable with the highest structure coefficient was utilized to "name" discriminant function 1. Function 1 was named "Importance" and reflected the relative influence of the IMPORT's structure coefficient (.90). However, the nature of function 2 in discriminating among cases suggested that Function 2 should be named "Polarized" from the influence of CERTAIN = .74 and EXTREM = .68 (i.e. deviation from a mid point).

The standardized canonical coefficients demonstrated that IMPORT (.71) and DIREXP (.43) were the two most influential attitude properties that determined an individual's loyalty classification. These weights indicated that the three groups differed on the amount of significance and value placed in their attitudes toward the team and the amount of personal experience from which their attitudes was derived. The structure coefficients above .30 demonstrated that higher levels of loyalty were accompanied by: 1) attitudes that produced more emotional feeling toward the Indians (INTENS = .63), 2) attitudes based upon more relevant knowledge of the Indians, (KNOWL = .54) and 3) attitudes that were more favorable toward the team (EXTREM = .32).

The results also indicated that the confidence and conviction (CERTAIN) an individual had in their attitude toward the Indians was not sufficient to distinguish among the three groups of loyalty. Furthermore, an individual's evaluation of his or her attitude against incoming information about the Indians did not differentiate between the three groups of loyalty. In addition, the consistency between an individual's feelings and beliefs toward the Indians was not a good attitude property to separate individuals into loyalty groups.
Cross Validation of Discriminant Functions

A cross validation procedure was employed to assess the predictive ability of the discriminant functions. The overall sample of 379 was randomly split in two validation samples (n = 197) and (n = 182) to test the internal stability of the discriminate functions. The cross validation procedure was utilized to test whether or not the results were generalizable to the population and not specific to the sample used to estimate the discriminate function. Discriminate functions were estimated for both sub-samples and then the results were compared. The results of cross validation procedure are presented in Table 4.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Overall N = 379</th>
<th>Sample 1 N = 197</th>
<th>Sample 2 N = 182</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT/DIREXP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>.70/.43</td>
<td>.78/.41</td>
<td>.64/.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>.90/.70</td>
<td>.90/.65</td>
<td>.85/.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rc</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained Variance</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification rate</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b = standardized discriminant function coefficient
s = within-groups structure coefficient
Rc = canonical correlation coefficient

Table 4.18 Split Sample Validation of Multiple Discriminant Estimation for Discriminant Variables IMPORT and DIREXP

Table 4.18 contained results from the overall discriminant analysis and the statistics estimated for two sub-samples. The dimensions of IMPORT and DIREXP were used to highlight the stability of the "Importance" function. The results demonstrated a high level
of similarity in terms of standardized coefficients, within-groups coefficients and canonical correlation coefficients. Furthermore, the explained variance for the overall sample (98%), sample 1 (97%) and sample 2 (98%) and classification rates of 80%, 82% and 76% indicated that the discriminate function was internally stable.

These results answered question 3 for the multiple discriminant analysis in that IMPORT and DIREXP were the most powerful discriminators of loyalty. The cross validation procedure demonstrated that the attitude dimensions IMPORT and DIREXP were the most influential discriminators for function 1 and were internally stable. Function 2, although statistically significant, did not yield enough power to discriminate all three groups. Furthermore, these results supported Hypothesis 3 in that the dimension of attitude importance was the most significant attitude property to identify allegiance to an athletic team.

Hypothesis Four:
The level of loyalty will moderate the stability of an individual's attitude structure when exposed to a persuasive appeal.

Phase II
To test hypothesis four, a pro attitudinal and counter attitudinal message was developed and pre-tested on a sample drawn from the original sample pool. Forty-seven students (n = 47) from the original sample (N = 379) were recruited to participate in the experimental pre-test session. Seventeen were female (36%) and thirty were male (64%). The average age for subjects was 21.96. Ninety four percent of subjects were from the 1:30 p.m. class and six percent were from the 5:30 p.m. class. A packet of material which contained either a pro or counter attitudinal article related the Cleveland Indians was randomly distributed to each student (See Appendix I for experimental packet).
Students responded to six questions that measured their opinions of the article. A brief description, means and standard deviations for each item are presented in Table 4.20. Students who received the pro attitudinal message on average rated this article 6.42 on a 7 point scale. The standard deviation (SD = .72) for the pro attitudinal message indicated that students consistently rated this message as pro attitudinal (i.e. favorable) toward the Indians. In addition, the range of scores for the pro message was 4.0 to 7.0 which indicated that none of the students rated the message below the midpoint on the bipolar scale.

Students who responded to the pro attitudinal message reported that the authors were knowledgeable about the Indians (M = 5.63; range 3.0 to 7.0), the articles contained many facts (M = 5.42; range 3.0 to 7.0), considerable effort was put forth when reading the message (M = 5.79; range 3.0 to 7.0) and the articles contained many convincing facts (M = 5.33; range 2.0 to 7.0). Scores for previous knowledge about the Indians (M = 4.25; SD = 2.31; range 1.0 to 7.0) suggested that a wide range of previous knowledge about the Indians was held by this group of subjects.

Students who received the counter attitudinal articles on average rated this message 2.70 out of 7.0. The standard deviation SD = 1.79 and range of 1.0 to 6.0 for the counter message indicated less consistency among students for this message but supported the counter attitudinal perception (i.e. unfavorable intention) of the message. The mean scores for knowledge, convincing facts, effort and facts were rated consistently lower for the counter message than the pro message. The mean score for previous knowledge on the counter message (M = 4.48) was the only item rated higher than the pro attitudinal message (M = 4.25) by groups. This indicated that students perceived the articles as negative but were less sure about the content of the articles.
Table 4.19 Pre-Test Results for Student Opinions of Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Articles (N = 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors were knowledgeable</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles contained convincing facts</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous knowledge about Indians</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of effort in reading article</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles contained many facts</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles were negative (1) or positive (7)</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative Articles (N = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors were knowledgeable</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles contained convincing facts</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous knowledge about Indians</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of effort in reading article</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles contained many facts</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles were negative (1) or positive (7)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison between the type of message and subject's level of loyalty was conducted to examine the affect that loyalty toward the Indians had on the perception of the favorableness for each article type. A breakdown of the perceived favorableness by level of loyalty is presented in Table 4.20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message Type</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Counter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Rating</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td>(.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 Mean Student Ratings of Message Type by Subjects' Level of Loyalty for Pretest Session
An inspection of Table 4.20 indicated that individuals who were classified as loyal to the Indians rated the pro attitudinal message the most favorable ($M = 6.62$) and the counter attitudinal message as the most unfavorable ($M = 2.0$). Furthermore, high loyal subjects had the least amount of discrepancy (Pro $SD = .52$ and Counter $SD = 1.63$) in their evaluation of the messages. In contrast, low loyal individual rated the pro article as less favorable ($M = 6.13$) and the counter attitudinal message as more favorable ($M = 3.28$) with more discrepancy (Pro $SD = .79$ and Counter $SD = 1.79$).

A 2 x 2 (High vs. Low Loyalty x Pro vs. Counter Article) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on article ratings. Significant main effects for article type were observed $F(1,46) = 95.20$, $p < .01$. The pro article was rated as more favorable ($M = 6.42$) than the counter article ($M = 2.70$) $t = 9.41$, $df = 45$, $p < .01$ by all subjects. The main effects of article type were qualified by a marginal Article x Loyalty interaction $F(1,46) = 3.82$, $p < .057$. This interaction resulted from the fact that high loyal subjects rated the pro article as more favorable ($M = 6.62$) and the counter article as more unfavorable ($M = 2.0$) than low loyal subjects (pro $M = 6.13$ and counter $M = 3.28$). See Figure 2.

The results of the pre-test indicated that the messages created for the present study elicited the desired response. The pro attitudinal message was reported as favorable toward the Indians while the counter attitudinal message was reported as unfavorable to the team. However, the pre-test study did not include a cognitive response section to reveal subjects' thoughts as they read the articles or a recall of article facts section. Therefore, a cognitive response section was included for phase three of the study to examine the thoughts and recall of individual in response to the persuasive appeal.
Phase III: Pliability of Dimensions

Individuals who had completed the Cleveland Indians Baseball survey in Phase 1 and who had not participated in Phase 2 were recruited to participate in an experiment which took place during week eight of the winter quarter. One hundred and forty nine students 68 female (45.6%) and 81 male (54.4%) volunteered for the study. The average age was 21.63 and 112 (75%) were from the 1:30 p.m. class and 37 (24.8%) were enrolled in the 5:30 p.m. class.

Individuals were categorized as either high or low in loyalty by a median split on LOYALTY scores from Phase 1 (Low Loyalty $M = 1.58$; range from 1.0 - 2.21) and (High Loyalty $M = 4.40$; range from 2.25 - 7.0). A series of $2 \times 2 \times 3$ (Week 3 vs. Week 8 x Low vs. High Loyalty x Pro vs. Counter vs. Control Article) mixed-design analysis of
variance (ANOVA) were conducted on each of the eight attitude dimensions and two loyalty dimensions to determine the pliability of each dimension. Significant main effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFCOG</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTAIN</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIREXP</td>
<td>151.365</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREM</td>
<td>36.846</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT</td>
<td>202.23</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENS</td>
<td>126.15</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWL</td>
<td>91.15</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATREJ</td>
<td>6.165</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>245.95</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAV</td>
<td>195.11</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOYALTY</td>
<td>234.35</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 149 with 1 and 143 degrees of freedom

Table 4.21  Main Effects of Loyalty for Between Subjects Analysis of Variance

were observed for level of loyalty between subjects on each attitude and loyalty dimensions and are presented in Table 4.21.

No significant main effects were observed between subjects for article type nor the interactions among level of loyalty and article type. The repeated measure analysis revealed a significant main effect for time on AFFCOG \( F(1,143) = 10.70, p < .01 \); KNOWL \( F(1,143) = 12.47, p < .01 \); EXTREM \( F(1,143) = 4.25, p < .04 \), CERTAIN \( F(1,143) = 5.00, p < .03 \); COMMIT \( F(1,143) = 3.76, p < .05 \) and a significant Time x Article interaction for IMPORT \( F(2, 143) = 3.26, p < .04 \).
The effects for AFFCOG were qualified by a significant Time x Article x Loyalty interaction $F(2, 143) = 3.64, p < .03$. As depicted in Figure 3 and 4, this interaction resulted from the fact that the counter and control messages created more consistency between feelings and beliefs from in week 8 for low loyal individuals. The pro and counter message had greater impact on consistency for high loyal individuals than the control message.
An analysis of the affective and cognitive components of the AFFCOG dimension revealed significant movement for both components. The main effect of time for the affective component $E(1,143) = 8.72, p < .01$ and the 2-way interaction Time x Article $E(2,143) = 7.03, p < .01$ were qualified by a Time x Article x Loyalty interaction $E(2,143) = 6.31, p < .01$ (See figure 5). This interaction resulted from the fact that the positive message had increased subjects' feelings toward the team for low loyal subjects while the negative message decreased feelings.
An analysis of the belief component of AFFCOG dimension revealed a Time x Article interaction $F(2,143) = 7.07, p < .01$ but was qualified by the Time x Article x Loyalty interaction $F(2,143) = 4.16, p < .02$ (See Figure 6). This interaction resulted from the fact that the positive message increased belief scores about the team while the negative message decreased subjects' beliefs about attributes related to the team.
Post Hoc tests were conducted to compare the pro, counter and control articles on the two components related to AFFCOG (i.e. feelings and beliefs). Dunnett’s 3-sided \( t \) tests revealed that the pro message significantly increased feelings (i.e. affective reactions) toward the team as opposed to the counter message (\( M \) difference of 4.06, \( p < .03 \)). No significant difference was observed between the pro and control article. The counter message generated lower scores for feelings toward the Indians as compared to feelings generated by the control message (\( M = \) difference of 3.92, \( p < .04 \)).

The pro article had greater impact on increasing subjects belief scores about the team than the counter article (\( M \) difference of 5.43, \( p < .01 \)). No significant differences were observed for the pro and control article. The counter message generated lower belief scores about the team versus the control message (\( M \) difference of 3.71, \( p < .03 \)).
A paired sample t test was conducted to contrast the AFFCOG dimension for week 3 and week 8 on all subjects for the three articles. The counter article had a significant impact on increased consistency between feelings and beliefs about the team $t = 2.42$, $df = 54$, $p < .02$. The pro and control article had no significant effect. A series of paired sample t test were conducted for the type of article by level of loyalty. High loyal individuals showed more consistency for the pro article $t = 3.69$, $df = 27$, $p < .01$ and counter article $t = 2.19$, $df = 22$, $p < .04$. Low loyal individuals demonstrated more consistency for the control article $t = 2.21$, $df = 16$, $p < .04$ and the counter article $t = 1.8$, $df = 16$, $p < .08$.

The main effect of time on KNOWL was qualified by a Time x Article x Loyalty interaction $F(2,143) = 2.79$, $p < .06$ (See figure 7 and 8). Although marginally significant, this interaction resulted from the fact that low loyal subjects reported more knowledge about the team from the pro message than either the counter or control message. In addition, high loyal subjects reported more knowledge related to the team from the counter message.

A paired sample t test for KNOWL from week 3 to week 8 was conducted on all subjects for each message type. The counter article produced high levels of KNOWL for subjects in week 8 $t = -3.10$, $df = 54$, $p < .01$. No impact was observed for the positive and control article. Tests conducted on knowledge for article by level of loyalty revealed that high loyal subjects who received the counter article reported more knowledge $t = 3.21$, $df = 22$, $p < .01$. Low loyal subjects who received the pro article reported more knowledge $t = -3.02$, $df = 23$, $p < .01$. 


Figure 7  Time x Article Type on Knowledge Interaction for Low Loyalty Subjects

Figure 8  Time x Article Type on Knowledge Interaction for High Loyalty Subjects
Extremity responses for each subject were recoded in terms of valence and utilized for the within factor. The main effect of time for EXTREM $E(1,146) = 4.25, p < .04$ was qualified by Time x Article interaction $E(2, 143) = 6.10, p < .01$. This interaction resulted from the fact that the pro attitudinal article increased subject's extremity scores from week 3 ($M = 5.20$) to week 8 ($M = 5.68$) $t = -4.22, df = 51, p < .01$. The Time x Article interaction was qualified by a marginally significant Time X Article X Loyalty interaction $E(2,143) = 2.03, p < .06$. This interaction resulted from the fact that individuals reported higher extremity scores after exposure to the pro and control articles. Low loyal subjects who read the pro article reported more extremity in week 8 ($M = 4.57$) than week 3 ($M = 3.90$) $t = -4.30, df = 23, p < .01$. High loyal subjects who received the control article reported more higher extremity scores in week 8 ($M = 6.13$) than previously in week 3 ($M = 4.14$) $t = -2.23, df = 24, p < .04$.

The main effect of time for COMMIT dimension $E(1,143) = 3.76, p < .05$ was analyzed with a series of paired sample $t$ test and revealed that high loyal individuals reported higher attitude scores toward the team from the control article $t = 2.39, df = 24, p < .03$. Low loyal individuals reported higher attitude scores from the pro article but was marginally significant $t = -1.88, df = 23, p < .07$. A paired sample $t$ test for the main effect of time for CERTAIN $E(1,143) = 5.00, p < .03$ revealed that the control article had a marginally significant impact on more attitude certainty $t = 1.95, df = 16, p < .07$.

A significant Time x Article interaction was observed for IMPORT $E(2,143) = 3.26, p < .04$ (See figure 9 and 10). This interaction resulted from the fact that the pro article had greater impact on the importance placed in the team than the counter or control message for low loyal individuals. For high loyal individuals, the pro article had a greater impact on importance than the counter and control article.
Figure 9  Time x Article Type on Importance Interaction for Low Loyalty Subjects

Figure 10  Time x Article Type on Importance Interaction for High Loyalty Subjects
A paired sample t test was conducted on time for IMPORT and revealed that the pro article overall increased importance for those subjects who received this article t = 2.24, df = 51, p < .03. Further t test analysis by level of loyalty revealed that the pro article had a significant impact on high loyal individuals' importance in the team for week 8 t = 2.48, df = 27, p < .02.

The results indicated that AFFCOG, KNOWL, and CERTAIN were the most pliable attitude dimensions from week 3 to week 8 in the study. The COMMIT dimension yielded the only movement across time for loyalty measures. IMPORT was the only attitude dimension which was affected by a Time x Article interaction. Changes from week 3 and week 8 for AFFCOG and KNOWL were qualified by a Time x Article x Loyalty interaction.

Thought Measures and Article Recall

Cognitive responses and recall of article facts were collected from subjects. Subjects were asked to list any thoughts they could remember going through their minds as they read the articles. Subjects were then asked to write down any facts they could recall from the articles. Cognitive responses were coded into positive thoughts, negative thoughts and neutral thoughts by two judges blind to the experimental condition and subjects' level of loyalty. Recall was coded with regard to matching the facts reported from each article. Judges agreed on cognitive response coding in over 85% of the cases and agreed on coding of recall in over 95% of the cases. Disagreements were resolved by discussion.

The mean number of favorable thoughts, unfavorable thoughts, neutral thoughts and recall of article facts from each message type are reported in Table 4.22. A 3 x 2 (Pro vs. Counter vs. Control Article x Low vs. High Loyalty) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on each type of thought reported and facts recall from each message. No
main effects were observed for level of loyalty. A main effect was observed for number of favorable thoughts reported $F(2,143) = 10.34$, $p < .01$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thoughts</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Counter</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 Mean Type of Thoughts and Recall for Pro, Counter and Control Messages

Dunnett's $t$ 3-sided post hoc analysis revealed that subjects reported significantly more favorable thoughts ($M = 1.54$) from the pro attitudinal article compared to both the counter attitudinal article ($M = .55$) $p < .01$ and the control article ($M = .86$) $p < .02$. No differences were observed between the counter and control articles for favorable thoughts.

A main effect was observed for article type and number of unfavorable thoughts reported $F(2,143) = 14.66$, $p < .01$. Dunnett's $t$ 3-sided post hoc analysis revealed that subjects reported significantly more unfavorable thoughts ($M = 1.84$) from the counter attitudinal article compared to the either the pro attitudinal article ($M = .71$) $p < .01$ or the control article ($M = 1.07$) $p < .01$. No difference were observed for unfavorable thoughts between the pro and control articles.

A main effect was observed for article type and number of neutral thoughts reported $F(2,143) = 3.39$, $p < .04$. Dunnett's $t$ 3-sided post hoc analysis revealed that subjects reported significantly more neutral thoughts ($M = .55$) from the control article compared to the counter attitudinal article ($M = .22$) $p < .04$. Although subjects reported more neutral thoughts from the control article compared to the pro attitudinal article ($M =$
.29) p < .15 it was not significant. No difference were observed for neutral thoughts between the pro and counter attitudinal articles.

These results indicated that experimental treatments were valid, reliable and elicited the desired responses from subjects regardless of loyalty. The pro attitudinal article fostered more favorable thoughts. The counter attitudinal article fostered more unfavorable thoughts while the control article fostered more neutral thoughts. Furthermore, the number of facts recalled from each article type were consistent (pro $M = 2.71$; counter $M = 2.87$; control $M = 2.83$) and no differences emerged from the total number of thoughts reported from each message type (pro $M = 2.54$; counter $M = 2.60$, control; $M = 2.50$).

When the level of loyalty was considered, the direction of thought was consistent with the type of article. The mean number of thoughts and recall for each article type as a function of loyalty are reported in Table 4.23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Low Loyalty</th>
<th>High Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 Mean Number of Thoughts and Recall as a Function of Loyalty and Article Type

An inspection of the means in Table 4.23 indicated that more favorable thoughts for high ($M = 1.64$) and low ($M = 1.42$) loyal subjects were observed from exposure to
the pro attitudinal article than unfavorable or neutral thoughts $F(2,146) = 11.58, p < .01$. If the article was counter attitudinal, more unfavorable thoughts were reported by high ($M = 1.70$) and low ($M = 1.94$) than other thoughts $F(2,146) = 15.41, p < .01$. The control article generated more neutral thoughts for both high ($M = .60$) and low ($M = .47$) loyal groups $F(2,146) = 4.0, p < .02$. Furthermore, there were more favorable thoughts reported than neutral thoughts $t = 5.60, df = 148, p < .01$ and more unfavorable thoughts reported than neutral thoughts $t = 7.81, df = 148, p < .01$. These findings resulted from the fact that the type of thoughts were aligned with the intent of the appeal regardless of the level of loyalty and further supported the reliability and validity of the three experimental conditions.

However, significant differences were observed for the number of favorable thoughts elicited by high loyalty subjects in response to the counter attitudinal message. High loyal subjects reported more favorable thoughts ($M = .91$) in response to the counter attitudinal article than low loyal subjects ($M = .28$) subjects $t = 2.59, df = 53, p < .01$. Differences also emerged for the number of favorable and unfavorable thoughts reported for high and low loyal subjects. High loyal subjects reported more favorable thoughts in general ($M = 3.39$) than low loyalty subjects ($M = 2.58$) $t = 1.94, df = 77, p < .05$. In contrast, low loyal subjects reported more unfavorable thoughts ($M = 3.72$) than high loyal subjects ($M = 2.00$) $t = 6.29, df = 72, p < .01$. These results indicated that the level of loyalty determined the type of thoughts and the number of thoughts produced from a persuasive appeal.

A 2 X 3(High vs. Low Loyalty x Pro vs. Counter vs. Control) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on recall of article facts revealed a main effect for loyalty $F(1,143) = 9.45, p < .01$. The main effect of loyalty resulted from the fact that high loyal subjects recalled more facts ($M = 3.22$) than low loyal subjects ($M = 2.37$) $F(1,147) = 7.28, p < .01$. However,
the main effect for loyalty was qualified by a Loyalty X Article interaction $F(2,143) = 4.91, p < .01$ (See figure 11).

This interaction resulted from the fact that high loyal subjects recalled more facts from the pro article ($M = 3.36$) than low loyal subjects ($M = 1.96$) $t = 3.08, df = 50, p < .01$. Furthermore, high loyal subjects reported more facts ($M = 3.60$) from the control article than low loyal subjects ($M = 1.71$) $t = 2.75, df = 40, p < .01$. In contrast, low loyal subjects recalled more article facts from the counter attitudinal article than either the pro or control articles $F(2,70) = 4.53, p < .01$. Dunnett's $t$ 3-sided post hoc analysis revealed that low loyal subjects recalled significantly more facts from the counter article ($M = 3.03$) than the pro article ($M = 1.96$) $p < .05$ and the control article ($M = 1.71$) $p < .04$. These results indicated that the level of loyalty biased the recall of article facts from a persuasive appeal.

![Diagram of Recall of Facts](image)

**Figure 11** Loyalty x Article Type on Recall of Article Fact Interaction
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Attitude Change and Valenced Thoughts

A correlational analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the type of thoughts and the amount of within subject attitude change for AFFCOG, CERTAIN, EXTREM, IMPORT and KNOWL. A ratio of positive to negative thoughts was calculated for each subject and compared to differences observed from week 3 to week 8 on each attitude property. A negative correlation was observed between the ratio of positive to negative thoughts and changes within IMPORT $r = -.27$ and EXTREM $r = -.28$; ($n = 99, p < .01$). This correlation resulted from the fact that change within attitude importance and extremity from week 3 to week 8 were associated with a greater number of positive thoughts than negative thoughts. The level of importance and extremity toward the Indians increased in correspondence with the number of positive thoughts. No significant correlation was observed for AFFCOG, CERTAIN, or KNOWL.

Individuals were categorized as either a high or low in attitudinal commitment by a median split on subject's initial level of COMMIT toward the Indians in week 3 (Low COMMIT $M = 1.72$; range 1.0 - 2.61) and (High COMMIT $M = 4.79$; range 2.62 - 7.0). A correlational analysis was conducted on the ratio of positive to negative thoughts and the amount of within subject change for each attitude property. A negative correlation was observed between the ratio of positive to negative thoughts and changes within IMPORT $r = -.28$, $n = 52$, $p < .04$ and EXTREM $r = -.34$, $n = 52$, $p < .01$ for low COMMIT individuals. This correlation resulted from the fact that higher levels of importance and extremity in week 8 were associated with a greater number of positive than negative thoughts for individuals with weak initial commitment toward the Indians. No significant correlation was observed for high COMMIT individuals.

The relationship between the amount of within subject attitude change and type of thoughts was analyzed after controlling for the type of article. A negative correlation was observed for changes within IMPORT $r = -.40$, $n = 25$, $p < .01$, EXTREM $r = -.45$, $n =$
25, \( p < .02 \) and AFFCOG \( r = .40, n = 25, p < .05 \) and a ratio of positive to negative thoughts for low COMMIT individuals who received the pro attitudinal article. This correlation resulted from the fact that higher levels of IMPORT and EXTREM in week 8 corresponded to a greater number of positive thoughts. Furthermore, those subjects who reported less consistency between feelings and beliefs about the Indians in week 8 reported a greater number of positive thoughts. No significant correlation was observed for High COMMIT individuals nor the counter or control article.

A correlational analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the amount of within subject change for COMMIT from week 3 to week 8 and changes within each of the eight attitude properties. A positive relationship was observed between change within COMMIT and changes within IMPORT \( r = .33 \), INTENS \( r = .27 \), KNOWL \( r = .21 \) and CERTAIN \( r = .21 \); \( n = 149, p < .01 \). When the level of initial COMMIT was considered, a positive correlation was observed between the change within COMMIT and changes within IMPORT \( r = .44 \) and INTENS \( r = .35 \); \( n = 73, p < .01 \) for individuals low in COMMIT. This correlation resulted from the fact that the direction of change within COMMIT was associated with the direction of changes within the properties of IMPORT and INTENS for individuals low in initial commitment toward the Indians. In contrast, a positive correlation was observed for individuals high in COMMIT between the change within COMMIT and changes within KNOWL \( r = .38 \) and CERTAIN \( r = .37 \); \( n = 76, p < .01 \). This correlation resulted from the fact that the level of COMMIT increased in correspondence to changes within the properties of KNOWL and CERTAIN for individuals high in initial commitment toward the Indians.

Differences in message recall of article facts emerged. For those who received the positive article, high loyal subjects recalled more often than low loyal subjects that: the team went to the world series in 1995 and 1997 = 80%; Indians were the third ranked sports team in franchise value = 66%; Old stadium converted to fishing piers = 86%, more
restaurants and business because of the team = 87% and the Indians have had sell outs the last two seasons = 73%. High loyal subjects remembered 75% more of these facts than low loyal subjects.

For those who received the negative article, low loyal subjects recalled more often than high loyal subjects that: taxpayers will pay $110 per year for the next 30 years for stadium construction = 67%; the team is getting worse = 100%; attendance is down = 80%; team is a burden on taxpayers = 73%; ticket prices have increased = 89% and 90% of Indians' fans live within a 30 mile radius = 80%. Low loyal subjects remembered 77% more of these facts than high loyal subjects.

Differences in article facts emerged in the control group. High loyal subjects consistently recalled more facts than low loyal subjects from the Brewers article. High loyal subjects recalled more often that the Braves switched to the National League = 57%; A new stadium will be built in the year 2000 = 50%; Marquis Grissom as the outfielder for the Brewers = 80%, and that the old Brewers relocated to Atlanta and are now the Atlanta Braves = 100%.

Summary of Hypotheses:

The findings provided mixed support for Hypothesis 1. Three attitude properties were useful to predict commitment and four properties were useful to predict behavior related to the Cleveland Indians. Certainty, Extremity, Intensity and Latitude of Rejection were not found to be useful predictors. Importance and Direct Experience were stable predictors and explained 84% of the variance in commitment. Importance, Direct Experience and Knowledge were stable predictors and explained 83% of the variance in behavior. Although Affective-Cognitive Consistency was a significant predictor of behavior and commitment, it was deemed unstable from the cross validation analysis.
The findings provided support for Hypothesis 2. Significant differences were observed among high, moderate and low allegiant individuals for each of the eight attitude properties. These findings suggest that the structural composition of an individual's attitude related to the Cleveland Indians varied with the level of loyalty. Importance and Direct Experience were two powerful discriminators of loyalty and used to classify individuals into high, moderate and low loyalty groups with 80% accuracy.

The findings provided support for Hypothesis 3. The psychological significance and value an individual placed in his or her attitude toward the Cleveland Indians was found to be the most influential attitude property related to loyalty. These findings suggest that the amount of personal importance attached to the Cleveland Indians determined the level of allegiance to the team.

The findings provided mixed support for Hypothesis 4. An individual's level of loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians was found to moderate the structural stability of certain attitude properties. Significant changes were observed from week 3 to week 8 for Affective-Cognitive Consistency, Knowledge, Extremity, Certainty and Importance. No changes were observed for the other four dimensions. The level of commitment moderated the relationship of the within subject change between the dimension of Commitment and the properties of Importance, Intensity, Knowledge and Certainty. Cognitive responses and article recall analysis revealed that the level of loyalty moderated an individual's motivation to read an article and biased cognition related to a specific persuasive appeal. The within subject change for Importance and Extremity corresponded to the number of positive thoughts.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The construct of loyalty has been of considerable interest to researchers and practitioners, however, within the field of athletics and sport the study of spectator loyalty remains largely unexplored at the academic level. Given the importance ascribed to loyalty in other disciplines (e.g. marketing, business, psychology, etc.), it is surprising that sport researchers have largely ignored its application to spectators. At present in sport, a model of fan loyalty does not exist which incorporates a theoretically guided framework to examine the construct of loyalty.

The present study recognized the need for the development of a psychometrically sound scale to examine fan loyalty. A previous scale did not exist that adequately measured the complexity of the loyalty construct in sport. The lack of attention given to theoretical frameworks of fan loyalty has led to poorly developed scales or single item measures whose reliability and validity are in question. Without proper measurement of this construct, a systematic study of fan loyalty would be difficult to conduct.

The following discussion has been divided into four sections. The first section provides a brief review of the data collection procedure utilized in the study. Section two details the predictive ability and relative influence of attitude properties on loyalty and the subsequent theoretical and practical implications. The third section summarizes results from the experimental portion of the study. Finally, the chapter concludes with recommendations for future research.
Procedure

The present study incorporated three phases to initiate an investigation into fan loyalty. Phase I examined the structural relations among eight latent attitude dimensions and their effect upon loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians. The eight attitude properties were affective-cognitive consistency, certainty, direct experience, extremity, importance, intensity, knowledge and latitude of rejection which have all received a great deal of empirical attention in social psychology (e.g. Petty & Krosnick, 1995; Raden, 1985; Smith, 1968). The two dependent variables were behavior and commitment which provided a composite index for the loyalty construct (Day, 1969; Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978; Jacoby & Kyner, 1972). Independent and dependent variables used for this purpose were scores on the Cleveland Indians Baseball scale developed for the present study.

Phase II involved the development and pre-test of two persuasive appeals: a pro attitudinal and counter attitudinal message related to the Cleveland Indians baseball team. These two appeals were utilized along with a control message to develop treatment conditions for Phase III. Phase III examined the structural stability of each attitude property and whether changes could be induced by exposing subjects to a persuasive message. A 2 x 2 x 3(Week 3 vs. Week 8 x Low vs. High Loyalty x Positive vs. Negative vs. Control Article) mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to examine change in attitude structure.

The sample used in Phase I included 379 undergraduates from an introductory Marketing course at The Ohio State University. The sample for Phase II included 47 students recruited from the original sample in Phase I. The sample for Phase III included 149 students recruited from the original sample who had not participated in Phase III. Extra credit was awarded in exchange for student participation.

During week three of winter quarter 1998, participants in Phase I were asked to complete the Cleveland Indians Baseball survey and to indicate their age and gender (See
Appendix H). Participants were then instructed to sign up during week 6 to participate in extra course credit. Phase II was held during week 6 to pretest pro attitudinal and counter attitudinal messages developed for the study (See Appendix I). Participants were given a packet of information which contained either the pro or counter attitudinal article and then completed the Cleveland Indians Baseball survey a second time. All data for Phase II were collected in two experimental sessions during week 7. Phase III was conducted during week eight. All data for this phase were collected during eleven experimental sessions identical to Phase III but with the addition of a control message. Participants received one of three articles and then completed the Cleveland Indians Baseball survey a second time (See Appendix I & J).

The data collected from the participants were analyzed using LISREL 8.0 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) and SPSS statistical software package at The Ohio State University. The initial version of the scale consisted of 76 items and represented 12 sub-scales. A panel of experts and field tests provided evidence of scale validity such that content and format was consistent with variable definitions (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1995). Although a few minor changes were implemented, the classification system was deemed appropriate. Based upon these results, evidence for scale content validity had been demonstrated.

Evidence of content validity was also examined in regards to reliability. Initial scale development relied primarily upon item-to-total correlation analysis to clarify the conceptual framework and examine reliability. From this procedure, dimensions of personal relevance and accessibility were identified as unstable and dropped from the present study. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) procedures indicated that the 10 sub-scales for the Cleveland Indians Baseball scale were very reliable with reliability coefficients greater than or equal to .78 for a mean of .89 (See Table 4.1). Furthermore, a
parsimonious scale had been developed with three to five items per sub-scale. After scale purification, the scale was reduced to 40 items with 10 sub-scales.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was employed to confirm the measurement and structural model of fan loyalty (See Appendix N). The more rigorous confirmatory factor analysis was employed after a stable sub-scale structure had been identified to examine whether the hypothesized sub-scale structure was supported by the data. Confirmatory factor analysis is considered a powerful method of construct validation (Hair et al., 1995). SEM accounted for measurement error in the estimation process of multiple and interrelated dependence relationships by specifying the rules of correspondence between the observed and latent variables. SEM provided a straightforward means to assess the statistical efficiency of multiple relationships simultaneously and provided a transition from exploratory to confirmatory analysis (Hair et al., 1995).

Fan Loyalty

The measurement model and hypothesized structural model of fan loyalty for the present study achieved an adequate fit for the data collected (e.g. Bentler & Bonett, 1980; Bollen, 1989; Hair et al., 1995; Wheaton et al., 1977) (See table 4.2 for fit measures). The results indicated that scale items designed to measure the eight latent attitude dimensions and two loyalty dimensions were valid and reliable for the sample. Support for construct validity and reliability for the attitude property sub-scales emerged from the replication of Krosnick et al.,'s (1993) sub-scales in a sport domain.

The present study provided evidence for a hypothesized relationship between the construct of loyalty and properties of an individual's attitude. Similar models or scales were not available in the sport literature to compare the Cleveland Indians scale to gain insight into its significance within the sport domain. One caveat for the present study was that comparisons between scales and the proposed structural model of fan loyalty could
not be made. However, comparisons were available for the hypothesized structural model of fan loyalty to models of attitude properties proposed in the area of social psychology.

In general, these findings were consistent with Abelson (1988), Bassili (1996), Krosnick et al., (1993), Lastovicka and Gardner, (1979) and Verplanken (1989) in that latent attitude properties are conceptually and empirically distinct. The observed association between loyalty and latitude of rejection ($R^2 = .06$) and affective-cognitive consistency ($R^2 = .04$) as well as their independence from the dimensions of importance, intensity, direct experience and knowledge were consistent with Krosnick et al.'s (1993) findings. Furthermore, the observed relationship between loyalty and certainty ($R^2 = .29$) and extremity ($R^2 = .42$) suggested that these two dimensions may more appropriately reflect a polarized latent construct than a loyalty construct. The results demonstrated that between 59% and 72% of the variance in certainty and extremity was not explained by the loyalty construct.

Krosnick et al., (1993) and Krosnick and Petty (1995) have recommended not to conceptualize a second order general attitude strength factor as representing various first order latent attitude properties. Taken together, this body of research and the present study suggests that a second order latent factor structure may not be stable and conceptually appropriate. The findings of the present study support previous work in social psychology as to the structural distinctiveness among certain attitude properties. However, it should be noted that in the present study certain attitude properties were found to bundle together and reflect a second order latent construct of loyalty. The present findings demonstrated that loyalty as a second order construct accounted for a notable amount of variance in four attitude properties: importance ($R^2 = .97$), intensity ($R^2 = .95$), direct experience ($R^2 = .82$) and knowledge ($R^2 = .84$). These results demonstrated that loyalty accounted for 81% to 97% of the variance in the attitude properties of importance, intensity, knowledge and direct experience. As such, loyalty
represents those attitudinal attributes generated from subjective beliefs (i.e. importance and intensity) and cognitive structures (i.e. knowledge and direct experience) that have been found to be related to four consequences of persistence, resistance, impact cognition and behavior (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Although the proposed model should fit equally well in an entirely new sample of fans, judgment as to the stability of the model should be reserved until such a procedure is employed.

Loyalty in the present study was operationalized in terms of two strength consequences (i.e. resistance and behavior) which may account for structural relationship observed between the attitude properties and loyalty. The high levels of association observed between loyalty and commitment ($R^2 = .97$) and loyalty and behavior ($R^2 = .95$) indicated that loyalty represents two highly related defining features (i.e. consequences) of strong attitudes (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Although highly related, the absolute fit measures provided evidence for the conceptual distinctiveness of the attitudinal and behavioral dimension of loyalty (See table 4.3 for fit measures). The multi-dimensional perspective of loyalty achieved a close fit for the data and a better fit than the one dimensional model perspective. As such, loyalty may be operationalized as a general strength factor that reflects the consistency between commitment and behavior.

Previous research in social psychology has demonstrated that attitude properties which have crystallized and become strong were related to resistance and behavior (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995; Raden, 1985). However, the present study found that four properties: affective-cognitive consistency, latitude of rejection, certainty and extremity were not related to loyalty. Hence, these four properties were not related to commitment (i.e. resistance) and behavior. The low association observed between loyalty and affective-cognitive consistency and latitude of rejection may have stemmed from the use of a single item manifest variable in the SEM analysis. Various statistical scholars have cautioned against the appropriateness and stability of using 1-item measures in SEM (e.g.
As such, the relationship observed between loyalty and these two dimensions must be viewed with caution. Until new procedures are developed to operationalize these two properties, their inclusion in SEM analysis may be unsuitable.

The observed relationship between loyalty and attitude extremity and certainty suggests that these two dimensions were not related to commitment and behavior. However, these properties have conceptual and operational features that differ from the other six properties that should be considered when the results are interpreted. Certainty represented the conviction and confidence an individual had in his or her attitude about the Indians regardless of loyalty. Extremity was operationalized as the deviation from some neutral point on a scale but the direction of that deviation was not accounted for in the analysis. Highly allegiant fans as well as non loyal fans were both certain of their attitudes and extreme in their evaluations of the Indians whereas moderately loyal fans held less certain and extreme attitudes.

The type of curvilinear pattern (i.e. inverted U) observed for certainty and extremity from high, moderate and low individuals confound the observed relationship between these two attitude properties and loyalty. These two properties represent an emotive polarity in terms of their association to loyalty not found in the other six attitude properties. Extremity represents an attribute related to the strength related dimension of attitude aspects while certainty reflects an attribute related to the dimension of subjective beliefs (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995). The similarity found in attributes related to these two dimensions suggest that attitude aspects and subject beliefs may combine or interact to crystallize an attitude in one direction or the other. Future statistical analysis should be incorporated to delineate the conceptual and operational distinctiveness of these two attitude properties to gain a clearer understanding of their relationship to behavior and commitment as well as how the interrelations between the dimensions of subjective beliefs and attitude aspects. Furthermore, the operationalization of extremity in terms of valence...
(i.e. degree of favorability) may provide a clearer picture as to its relationship to commitment and behavior.

This study provided initial evidence of the underlying structure of attitude properties related to an individual's loyalty to an athletic team. Attributes (i.e. properties) found within the strength related dimension of subjective beliefs was found to be related to the attributes within the cognitive structure and the attitude aspects dimension. No relationship emerged with the processes dimension. This supports Krosnick and Petty's (1995) notion that some of the four strength related dimensions may overlap and reflect a higher order construct. Furthermore, this study simultaneously examined the relationship between the four strength related dimensions and two strength features. These results demonstrated the uniqueness of the property importance that reflects an attribute found within the dimension of subjective beliefs.

These results support previous studies in social psychology as to the distinctiveness of attitude properties within a sport domain. Furthermore, the construct of loyalty was found to reflect the consistency between behavior and commitment. The present study provides evidence for the complexity of loyalty stipulated by the multidimensional perspective held by Backman and Crompton (1991), Day (1969), Jacoby and Chestnut (1978), Jacoby and Kyner (1972), and Pritchard (1992).

These results provided the initial framework for a measurement and structural model of fan loyalty from which subsequent investigations can now proceed. As such, the present study was able to examine the simultaneous influence of various attitude properties on two defining features of attitude strength (i.e. resistance and behavior) as called for by Krosnick and Petty (1995). The utility of the present framework was that the relationship between attitude properties and loyalty could be now be examined using raw data. Composite scores from each sub-scale could now be calculated and utilized from the
raw data to represent attitude and loyalty dimensions instead of standardized latent factor scores.

Predictive Ability of Attitude Dimensions

Stepwise regression was performed to determine which attitude properties would make a significant contribution to the prediction of commitment and behavior (e.g. Stevens, 1992). There were two main findings from the regression analysis. First, importance, direct experience and affective-cognitive consistency were able to explain 84% ($R^2 = .84$) of the variance in an individual's commitment toward the Indians. Second, these three dimensions with the addition of knowledge explained 83% ($R^2 = .83$) of the variance in reported behavior toward the team. The most influential predictor was importance which accounted for 80% ($R^2 = .80$) of the variance in commitment and 74% ($R^2 = .74$) of the variance in behavior. Direct experience explained an additional 4% ($R^2 = .04$) of the variance in commitment and 7% ($R^2 = .07$) in behavior while knowledge explained an additional 1% ($R^2 = .01$) of the variance in behavior.

It should be noted that intensity was not found to be a significant predictor of either commitment or behavior in the regression analysis. These findings seem to be in conflict with the SEM results in which loyalty accounted for 93% of the variance in intensity. Two reasons are offered to account for these results. First, regression analysis does not account for the error while SEM utilizes an error term. Second, results of the item-to-total correlation analysis suggested that intensity was an unstable dimension. (See Appendix K) Scale item # 2 loaded higher on the dimensions of importance and direct experience than its own intensity dimension. Furthermore, scale item # 27 loaded higher on the importance dimension. Although the intensity dimension was kept for conceptual reasons, this decision may have not been appropriate. Importance and intensity as operationalized in the present study may not represent distinct attitude properties. In the
regression analysis, once importance was extracted it removed a large portion of the variance that intensity explained in commitment and behavior.

The predictive ability of importance to explain variance in commitment (i.e. resistance) was consistent with previous findings on the relationship between attitude importance and resistance (Fine 1957; Krosnick, 1988a; Krosnick et al., 1993; Rhine & Severence, 1970). These results also provide evidence for the proposed relationship between importance and both resistance and behavior (e.g. Boninger et al., 1995; Petty & Krosnick, 1995; Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995). Attitude importance represents a subjective sense of concern, caring and significance that an individual attaches to an attitude (Krosnick, 1988a; Wood, Kallgren & Presler, 1985). This significance should reflect a psychological commitment or investment on the part of the individual to his or her attitude toward the Indians (e.g. Crosby & Taylor, 1983). However, a surprising finding was the magnitude of variance importance explained in behavior versus that amount explained by direct experience.

The direct experience measure was developed to reflect the amount of direct experience and personal contact (i.e. reading, watching, talking, buying, attending, listening, etc.) an individual reported with regards to the Indians. As such, direct experience should have explained more variance in behavior than importance. Previous research has demonstrated that direct experience is more predictive of behavior (Fazio et al., 1982) and attitudes based upon indirect experience are poor predictors of behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

One reason for these results may come from items used to measure direct experience. Item #48 asked respondents, "How often have you participated in pre-game activities related to Cleveland Indians?" while #65 asked "post-game" activities. If respondents perceived these questions to mean actual "tailgating" at Jacobs Field, then Columbus's geographical proximity from Cleveland (approximately 142 miles) may have
prevented Ohio State students from attending games and participating in these activities. Therefore, lower scores for these items might be the cause for the present findings.

Although surprising, these findings support the notion that crystallized attitude properties are more predictive of resistance and behavior (Abelson & Krosnick, 1992; Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith 1995). A substantial amount of research in social psychology has demonstrated that the strong attitudes have a greater impact than weak attitudes on cognitive processes and social behavior (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995; Raden, 1985; Smith, 1968). This suggests that the importance an individual places in his or her attitude towards the Indians has the ability to predict consistency between behavior and attitudes.

Furthermore, when coupled with direct experience, 84% ($R^2 = .84$) of the variance in commitment was explained and 80% ($R^2 = .80$) of the variance in behavior was explained. The predictive ability of importance and direct experience in explaining variance in commitment and behavior indicate that these attitude dimensions may account for the attitude-behavior correspondence in team sports.

The dimension of affective-cognitive consistency was found to account for a significant amount of variance for both commitment .5% ($R^2 = .005$) and behavior .4% ($R^2 = .004$) but the cross validation procedure demonstrated it's instability as a predictor. The negative relationship observed between affective-cognitive consistency and both commitment and behavior suggest that higher levels of loyalty are accompanied by greater consistency between feelings and beliefs about the Indians (i.e. equivalent scores for both indices would create lower scores on this dimension). Strictly speaking, the congruence between affective-cognitive indices and higher evaluations of an object, behavior and resistance are consistent with previous research (Chaiken & Baldwin, 1981; Krosnick et al., 1993; Rosenberg, 1968).

The dimension of knowledge accounted for 1% ($R^2 = .01$) of the variance in behavior but was not a predictor of commitment. Although the amount of variance
explained was significant, knowledge may not be practical as a predictor of behavior towards athletic teams. Therefore, hypothesis one was met in that latent attitude dimensions are useful in predicting commitment and behavior toward an athletic team. Importance and direct experience were the most influential predictors and were found to explain behavior and commitment toward the Indians.

The theoretical implications are that importance as an attitude property represents the best predictor of behavior and commitment towards a sports team. This implies that attitude importance may be the driving force behind the consistency between attitudes and behavior in a sports domain. These results provide evidence of a strong link between an attitude property and two defining features of attitude strength (i.e. resistance and behavior). The findings of the present study are consistent with findings in social psychology in that important attitudes influence the attitude-behavior relationship (Boninger et al., 1995; Krosnick, 1988a, 1988b, 1989; Pelham, 1991).

Research on the origins of attitude importance suggest that social identification may operate as one determinant of attitude importance (Boninger et al., 1995). Social identity is that part of an individual's self concept which is derived from his or her knowledge of their membership within a group that has value and emotional significance attached to that membership (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). One aspect of self-concept which may be derived from "fandomship" is the self-esteem benefits derived from an association with an athletic team (Cialdini et al., 1979; Hirt et al., 1992; Snyder et al., 1986). The more an individual perceives his or her association with a team as providing emotional and value significance, the more importance that association becomes and their attitude in regards to fandomship.

Turner and Giles (1981) noted "identity with one's own team or the representatives of one's own institution, area of country, emphasize with their struggles and share vicariously in the emotions of victory and defeat" (p.2). The importance of group
membership for an individual was suggested as the principal force driving team identification (Wann & Branscombe, 1990). Hence, team importance would operate to mediate (e.g. Barron & Kenny, 1989) the influence of team identification. Higher levels of team importance may explain how and why the relationship between team identification and subsequent behavior is observed.

In the present study, individuals whom demonstrated high levels of team importance were found to exhibit higher levels of behavior and commitment toward the team. These findings suggest that attaching personal importance to an attitude related to an athletic team represents a substantial commitment by an individual to think, gather information and to use this information in making relevant decisions about an attitude and to design one's actions in accordance with the attitude (e.g. Boninger et al., 1995; Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992; Petty, Cacioppo, & Haugtvedt, 1992). The importance an individual places upon his or her attitude towards a sports team may be determined by the evaluation of the association and membership with the team which would determine subsequent behavior.

How Loyalty Groups Differ on Attitude Properties

The structural composition of attitude properties were examined in relation to level of loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians. A tripartite split was performed on the loyalty data collected in Phase I and multiple discriminant analysis was employed to analyze group differences. Significant differences were observed for the means of high, moderate and low loyalty groups on each of the eight attitude dimensions $F(2,376), p < .01$. These results support hypothesis two in that significance differences were found in the structural composition of each latent attitude dimensions between high, moderate and low allegiant individuals.
The means for the dimension of importance, intensity, knowledge, direct experience and latitude of rejection increased with the level of loyalty reported by subjects. These results indicated that as the level of loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians increased so too did the importance placed on the team, the emotional feeling created by the team, the knowledge an individual has about the team, the amount of personal contact with the team and the types of statements an individual finds objectionable about the team.

The dimensions of certainty and extremity, however, did not follow this pattern. Although significant differences were observed for means of high, moderate and low loyalty groups, individuals classified into high and low loyalty groups evaluated the Indians with more certainty and were more extreme in their evaluations than moderately loyal individuals. These results support findings that the more confidence and conviction individuals have in their attitudes the more extreme an object is evaluated and the more polarized the attitude should become (Abelson, 1995; Brent & Greenberg, 1982; Budd, 1986; Judd & Johnson, 1981; Tesser, Martin, & Mendolia, 1995). Consistent with these findings, loyal Cleveland fans would be just as certain and extreme in their attitudes as those individuals who detest the Indians.

The two discriminant functions derived were statistically significant at p < .001 and classified 80% of individuals correctly into their appropriate level of loyalty. Discriminant function 1 was the more powerful function and explained 77% ($R^2 = .77$) of the variance in the three loyalty groups. Function 1 was labeled the importance function due to the relative contribution of attitude importance's in discriminating among the three levels of loyalty. Discriminant function 2 only explained 7% ($R^2 = .07$) of the variance in group loyalty and was labeled the polarized function due to the relative importance of certainty and extremity. Function 1 was useful in distinguishing among levels of loyalty while Function 2 was useful in differentiating high and low loyal individuals from moderately loyal individuals.
When the eight attitude dimensions were considered simultaneously, the most important variables in discriminating levels of loyalty were importance and direct experience. The other six attitude properties were considered redundant in differentiating loyalty. These results indicated that high loyal individuals placed more psychological significance and value in the Indians and had more direct contact and experience with the team. In addition, higher levels of loyalty were accompanied by more emotional feeling towards the Indians, more extreme attitudes and greater levels of knowledge about the Indians. Furthermore, the confidence an individual has in their attitude, the consistency between feeling and beliefs, and the means by which an individual evaluates his or her attitude are useful in discriminating among the three levels of loyalty.

These results provide evidence of the effectiveness of utilizing scores from two attitude properties to classify fans into high, moderate and low loyal groups without previous knowledge of their actual loyalty. The predictive ability of loyalty classification through the use of importance and direct experience increased 47% over that of random placement and resulted in 70% fewer classification errors.

Consistent with the regression analysis, the most influential attitude properties were importance and direct experience. This indicated that attitude properties of importance and direct experience were the most significant predictors of levels of loyalty toward the Cleveland Indians. Although the polarized function (i.e. certainty and extremity) was not as powerful it may be useful in differentiation of high and low allegiance from moderate team allegiance. These results provide support for hypothesis 3 in that among the eight attitude properties, attitude importance was the most influential predictor of classifying an individual's loyalty toward an athletic team.

The theoretical implications are that the psychological significance and value one places in a sports team and the amount of direct contact one has had with a team can be used to explain differences in loyalty among fans. Higher scores on these dimensions are
related to higher levels of loyalty. The utility of the importance function is that an individual's level of loyalty (i.e. high, moderate or low) can be derived from their scores on attitude importance and direct experience. An unknown case can be classified into a loyalty category with 80% accuracy using only six items. The cross validation procedure provided evidence of the internal stability of the importance function's ability to classify unknown cases (overall sample = 80%, sample 1 = 82% and sample 2 = 76%).

These results provide sport researchers with the ability to diagnose and differentiate attitude properties of fans to understand their relationship to loyalty. Structural profiles can now be developed to assess group differences which enable researchers to understand the cognitive, affective, conative as well as behavioral differences which contribute to team loyalty. These profiles enable researchers to isolate how attitude properties bundle together or remain distinctive in order to determine the effect of experimental manipulations on loyalty. In addition, it allows for the identification of weak dimensions that could be systematically attacked or bolstered. Once a deficient or weak attitude property has been identified, efforts could be used to bolster this property and examine subsequent change in behavior and commitment toward sports team.

Furthermore, these findings highlight a potential problem that professional sport franchises may face in terms of the direct consumption of the sport experience. As the cost of attending a professional game continues to increase, fewer and fewer individuals will be able to afford to attend which may create a gradual shrinking of the pool from which loyal fans may emerge. Direct experience as a key predictor of loyalty suggests that professional sport teams may witness a reduction in their number of loyal fans in the near future. Sport franchises will have to develop alternative methods to induce personal and direct contact with the team through media outlets or the world wide web.

The practical implications of these findings are that profiles of loyalty can be developed to identify which spectators of a team are low, moderate and high in team
loyalty. Sport managers and marketers now have a framework to develop a brief questionnaire to create profiles of loyalty of their fan base. This scale provides an efficient and manageable 6-item instrument to be used in collecting data in applied settings (i.e. intercepts). Once profiles of loyalty are generated, decision about efforts to target a specific group can be made.

Mullin et al.,'s (1993) escalator model suggests that moderate users provide the most growth potential for sport organization to generate more business. Using the importance function, sport managers and marketers can identify moderate fans and develop promotional efforts specifically targeted at these individuals. Marketing and promotional cost could be reduced or redirected at this target population.

Numerous sectors utilize discriminant functions to conduct business affairs. For example, financial institutions such as banks and savings and loans incorporate discriminant functions to profile loan applicants into low, moderate and high credit risk categories. These organizations collect data about applicants on such variables as age, education level, income level, etc. to determine an individual's ability to pay back a loan. The present study provides the sport industry with a powerful function calculated from two variables importance and direct experience to develop profiles of consumers. Sport marketers and practitioners can now differentiate within their fan base and create specific promotional campaign designed to attract non loyal fans to step on the escalator (Mullin et al., 1993), push moderate loyal fans up the escalator and maintain high loyal fans at their current usage of products and services.

**Phase II and III**

The experimental portion of the present study examined the stability of each attitude property and how loyalty to an athletic team affects the processing of persuasive appeals. This knowledge would provide researchers with a theoretical framework to
understand the effects of motivational and ability factors on attitude change. If changes in specific attitude dimensions could be induced through a persuasive message, this information could prove useful in developing marketing and promotional efforts to propel the fan up the escalator.

Consistent with previous knowledge manipulations (e.g. Lewan & Stotland, 1961; McMichael, Unpublished), subjects were provided with new and specific information related to the Cleveland Indians to bolster the amount of team relevant knowledge. An additional experimental measure was introduced by embedding this knowledge in either a pro attitudinal or counter attitudinal format. A control condition was established through the use of Milwaukee Brewers article to compare results. Based on pretesting, the pro and counter attitudinal articles were concluded to be valid and reliable for their use in Phase III.

Cognitive responses taken in Phase III demonstrated that all three articles were valid and reliable. These results revealed that all subjects regardless of loyalty reported more positive thoughts from the pro attitudinal article $F(2,143) = 10.34, \ p < .001$, more negative thoughts from the counter attitudinal article $F(2,143) = 14.67, \ p < .001$ and more neutral thoughts from the control article $F(2,143) = 3.39, \ p < .04$. These responses provided evidence that the articles elicited the intended type of responses.

**Elaboration of Sports Fans**

The current study provided the first evidence that a person's allegiance to an athletic team serves two roles in a persuasion situation. Loyalty affected the extent or direction of argument elaboration and biased thinking of subjects in response to a persuasive appeal (e.g. Petty & Cacioppo, 1990; Petty, Kasmer, Haugtvedt, 1987). Higher levels of loyalty increased the extent of message elaboration which fostered greater
recall of article facts. High loyalty subjects recalled more article facts ($M = 3.22$) than low loyal subjects ($M = 2.37$), $F(1,147) = 7.28$, $p < .008$.

Levels of loyalty were also found to bias the types of thoughts and recall in response to persuasive appeals. High loyal subjects reported more favorable thoughts across experimental conditions ($M = 3.39$) than low loyal subjects ($M = 2.58$), $F(1.147) = 3.74$, $p < .06$. Higher loyalty subjects reported more favorable thoughts ($M = .91$) than low loyal subjects ($M = .28$) in response to the counter attitudinal appeal $t(53) = 2.59$, $p < .01$. Whereas lower levels of loyalty biased elaboration which fostered greater recall of article facts for the counter attitudinal appeal ($M = 3.03$) compared to the pro ($M = 1.96$) and control ($M = 1.71$) articles $F(2,70) = 4.53$, $p < .04$. Low loyal subjects also reported more unfavorable thoughts ($M = 3.72$) than favorable thoughts ($M = 2.58$), $t(72) = 6.22$, $p < .001$. The extent of elaboration and biased thinking help explain the underlying process through which loyalty contributed to pliability for the dimensions of affective-cognitive consistency, knowledge, extremity, certainty and importance.

**Affective-Cognitive Consistency**

An individual's loyalty was found to determine the affect of a persuasive appeal on affective and cognitive reactions over time as demonstrated by the 3-way Time x Article x Loyalty interaction $F(2,143) = 3.64$, $p < .03$. Individuals have been found to process information in a biased manner, reacting more favorably to information that supports their position than information that challenges it (Wood et al., 1995). Consistent with these findings, cognitive responses revealed that low loyal subjects were biased toward the counter attitudinal appeal while high loyal subjects were biased toward the pro and control appeal. This accounts for why low loyalty subjects' affective and cognitive reactions were aligned with the type of appeal but high loyal subjects were not. For low loyal subjects, the counter attitudinal and control articles increased consistency between feelings and
beliefs while the pro attitudinal article fostered inconsistency. The pro attitudinal message resulted in discrepancy between previously held feelings and beliefs about the Indians while the counter attitudinal and control messages generated more consistency between these two indices.

In contrast, high loyal subjects reported more stability in their affective-cognitive evaluation of the team regardless of article type. Cognitive responses revealed that high loyal individuals reported significantly more positive thoughts than low loyal individuals in response to the counter attitudinal message but recalled less article facts. The pro and counter attitudinal articles fostered greater consistency between feelings and beliefs about the Indians where as little change was observed for the control article. These findings are consistent with Chaiken and Baldwin (1981) and Rosenberg (1968) in that individuals high in affective-cognitive consistency are more difficult to persuade and more motivated to restore consistency than low consistency individuals when faced with a counter attitudinal message. The restoration of consistency accounts for why high loyal subjects reacted more positively (i.e. biased thinking) to the counter attitudinal article and recalled less facts.

These results indicated that the level of loyalty determined the stability and resistance of an individual's feelings and beliefs related to the Indians. However, loyalty's impact should be considered in relation to the amount of knowledge an individual possesses about an athletic team. One reason for the present findings were that high loyal individuals possessed larger amounts of knowledge about the Indians than low loyal individuals to evaluate an appeal. Furthermore, the significant 3-way Time x Article x Loyalty interaction $F(2,143) = 2.79$ $p < .06$ revealed that stability in knowledge was affected by the level of loyalty and type of appeal (See figure 2 and 3).
Knowledge

Although low loyal individuals reported more knowledge about the Indians in the second knowledge measure from all three articles, less change was observed for the control article (See Figure 7). In contrast, high loyal subjects reported more knowledge only from the control message (See Figure 8). The increased knowledge reported from the control article was surprising, however, cognitive responses revealed the Brewers article prompted low loyal subjects to think about the Indians and baseball in general which may account for this result. Furthermore, the interaction of testing and time may have confounded this measure (e.g. Fraenkel & Wallen, 1995) and created demand characteristics (e.g. Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).

For high loyal individuals, the positive and control article had little affect upon the second knowledge measure while more knowledge was reported after reading the counter attitudinal article. This suggests that material about the Indians contained in the counter attitudinal article (i.e. many facts were altered) was not previously known and that high loyal individuals actively processed the information into their knowledge base. As a result, they reported more knowledge about the team after reading the article but were unaffected by its unfavorableness.

The level of attitude-relevant knowledge has been found to influence resistance (Wood, 1982, Davidson et al., 1985) which may account for high loyal individuals' resistance to the counter attitudinal article. Cognitive responses revealed that high loyal subjects refuted information contained in the counter attitudinal appeal and began to counter-argue. That is, the arguments, "Dwindling attendance", "Business and restaurants struggle", and "Lack of pride in the Indians" etc. were consistently countered by high loyal subjects as not factual.

These findings suggest that the level of loyalty in conjunction with the amount of knowledge determined the impact of a specific message type. In persuasion studies, prior
knowledge has been suggested to bias processing when an individual receives a counter attitudinal message (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b). Cognitive responses revealed that low loyal subjects recalled more article facts ($M = 3.05$) from the counter attitudinal appeal than high loyal subjects ($M = 2.65$). Reactions to the counter attitudinal article occurred because high loyal individuals were able to draw upon previous information about the Indians to refute negative information. Low loyalty subjects were not able to draw upon an extensive knowledge base to help interpret the counter attitudinal message and were less able to critically evaluate the merits of the arguments presented in the article. Instead, their negative bias towards the Indians and lack of knowledge lead them to accept the information and recall more facts from the counter appeal.

These results are consistent with The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1986a) which suggests that under conditions where motivation and ability to engage in issue-relevant thinking are fostered more cognitive effort will be applied. Cognitive responses revealed that low loyal subjects were more motivated to process only the counter attitudinal appeal because of its congruence with their negative attitudes but did not have the ability (i.e. knowledge) to evaluate the information. In contrast, high loyal individuals were more motivated and had the ability to evaluate all of the articles. High loyal subjects refuted claims in the counter attitudinal appeal and pointed out discrepancies in the pro attitudinal article (e.g. Old Municipal stadium was incorrectly name Memorial stadium. Jacobs field was built when the Indians were still horrible) as well as the Indians old label "Mistake by the Lake". Furthermore, many loyal fans were upset that people in Cleveland are now BIRGing (Cialdini et al., 1979) and now subsequently supportive of the team as opposed to the lack of support they gave the team before 1994.

Hence, for high loyal subjects, the articles were more relevant and they had a high degree of knowledge about the Indians to evaluate the merits of the arguments presented
in the articles. As a result, central route processing may have occurred which would make the high loyal subjects' attitudes more resistant (e.g. Cacioppo et al., 1986; Haugtvedt et al., 1994; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Petty & Cacioppo, 1984).

**Extremity**

The main effect of time for extremity was qualified by a significant Time x Article interaction $F(2,146) = 6.10, p < .01$. This interaction resulted from the fact that subjects exposed to the pro attitudinal article reported more favorable attitudes toward the Cleveland Indians while no changes emerged from the counter and control article. However, when the level of loyalty was considered, a marginally significant Time x Loyalty x Article interaction was observed $F(2,143) = 2.03, p < .06$. The pro article induced low loyal subjects ($p < .01$) and high loyal subjects ($p < .06$) to rate the Indians as more favorable in week 8. Unexpectedly, high loyal subjects reported significantly higher levels of extremity in week 8 ($M = 6.13$) than in week 3 ($M = 4.14$) $t = -2.23$, $df = 24$, $p < .04$. These results indicated that high loyal subjects rated the Indians as more favorable after exposure to the Brewers article.

Cognitive responses indicated that some high loyal individuals were thinking of the Indians and had a high degree of baseball relevant knowledge as they read they Brewers article. The Brewers and the upcoming baseball season may have induced these subjects to think about the Indians. Fifteen individuals who received the Brewers article reported thoughts about the Indians and eight other subjects reported that "they were glad Marquis Grissom was doing well in Milwaukee". Grissom was traded from the Indians to the Brewers during the off season. High loyal subjects reported being, "happy for Brewer fans" and Marquis Grissom.

These responses suggest that the control article induced high loyal subjects to think about the Indians. These thoughts may have originated from greater involvement
with the sport of baseball which would have produced more Indians' related thoughts than those individuals low in loyalty (i.e. low baseball involvement) (e.g. Petty, Haugtvedt, & Smith, 1995). As their thoughts turned to the Indians, their attitudes became polarized and their evaluation of the team more favorable. Tesser et al., (1995) suggests that mere thought tends to make evaluations more extreme and more enduring.

These results provide evidence that mere thought induced by an unrelated message (i.e. a pro attitudinal message not directly relevant to the Indians) may be sufficient to induce higher levels of attitude extremity; provided that the individual was high in team loyalty (i.e. involvement) and had an extensive knowledge base to evaluate the message. These results suggests that mere thought may influence an individuals evaluation of a team and make that evaluation more favorable or extreme (e.g. Tesser et al., 1995). The impact that thought had on attitude extremity may also account for the changes that were observed for the attitude property certainty and the loyalty feature of commitment in response to the control article.

Certainty and Commitment

The main effect of time for certainty $F(1,143) = 5.00, p < .03$ and commitment $F(1,143) = 3.76, p < .05$ resulted from the fact that exposure to the control message induced changes from week 3 to week 8. High loyal individuals became more committed and certain of their attitudes after reading the Brewers article. The findings for certainty are consistent with Gross, Holtz and Miller (1995) in that mere thought may impact greater attitude certainty. However, explanations for the changes in commitment were difficult to interpret. Although a significant change in commitment was observed for high loyal subjects who received the control article ($p < .05$), an adequate explanation for this occurrence was not readily available. One explanation that accounts for greater attitude
certainty and commitment to the Indians comes from the impact that mere thought may have on attitude extremity and it’s relationship to other attitude properties.

Tesser et al., 1995 suggests that mere thought can strengthen attitudes when there is motivation to hold a particular position (i.e. favor toward baseball teams). As high loyal individuals read the Brewers article, cognitive responses revealed that substantial effort and recall were induced and thoughts about the Cleveland Indians resulted. A series of paired sample t-test controlling for the level of extremity revealed that the control article induced high extremity persons to hold more certain attitudes toward the Indians $t = -2.14$, df = 24, p < .04. No effects were observed for low extremity persons nor the pro or counter attitudinal article. Furthermore, high extremity persons exposed to the control article reported more commitment toward the Indians in week 8 ($M = 4.64$) than in week 3 ($M = 4.27$) $t = -3.35$, df = 24, p < .01. No differences emerged for the pro or counter articles.

These results suggest that the Brewers article induced high loyal subjects to think about the Indians and evaluate the team more favorably. As their attitudes became more extreme and polarized, they became more certain of their attitude and subsequently more committed to the Indians. This suggests that mere thought produced more extreme attitudes which in turn caused a reverberation within the network of attitude properties and activated higher levels of attitude certainty (e.g. see reverberation hypothesis, Krosnick & Petty, 1995). As high loyal subjects' read the Brewers article, their thoughts turned to the Cleveland Indians and their attitudes became more extreme. This extremity induced subjects to hold more confidence in their attitude toward the team and when buttressed by higher levels of knowledge, greater consistency between feelings and beliefs, their commitment toward the Indians increased.

Support for the reverberation hypothesis comes from Petty and Cacioppo (1979) in that as individuals become to perceive a message as relevant (i.e. baseball relevant),
cognitive effort is put forth to process the appeal. As high loyal individuals read the
Brewers article, cognitive responses revealed that substantial effort and recall were
induced and thought about the Cleveland Indians resulted. When such thinking has
occurred, "various cognitive and behavioral processes are set in motion to elevate some or
even most of the dimensions" (Krosnick & Petty, 1995; p. 10). Hence, these results imply
that mere thought about a team has the ability to activate a set of salient dimensions (i.e.
 extremity, certainty, knowledge, etc.) to which commitment toward the team is bolstered.

Further support may also be drawn from the correlational analysis of within subject
attitude change (See pg. 176). Change in the level of commitment toward the Indians
from week 3 to week 8 corresponded to changes within the properties of importance,
intensity, knowledge and certainty. These results suggests that when an individual's
importance, intensity, knowledge or certainty changes toward the Indians, that individual's
commitment toward the team will change in a similar manner. As such, if a set of salient
attitude properties can be activated and bolstered, this may in turn induce higher levels of
commitment toward the team.

A further distinction was observed for the relationship between attitude properties
importance, intensity, knowledge and certainty and the dimension of commitment. The
level of initial commitment to the Indians was found to moderate this relationship. For
highly committed individuals, the amount of within subject change for commitment was
found to correspond with changes to the properties of knowledge and certainty. In
contrast, low committed individuals were observed to have a correspondence between
change within intensity and importance and the change within commitment. These results
suggests that different attitude properties become more activated dependent upon the level
of commitment. If changes in commitment were desired for highly committed fans, the
attitude properties of certainty and knowledge should be activated and either induced or
weakened. Whereas for low committed fans, importance and intensity could be activated
and manipulated. These results suggest that changes within commitment are related to the activation of subjective attributes (i.e., importance and intensity) for low committed individuals while objective attributes (i.e., knowledge and certainty) are activated for highly committed individuals.

**Importance**

The results of the regression and discriminant analysis indicated that attitude importance was the most influential attitude property to predict commitment, behavior and loyalty to the Cleveland Indians. Of particular interest for the present study, was the stability of the importance dimension in the face of a persuasive appeal. A significant 2-way Time x Article interaction $F(2,143) = 3.26, p < .04$ was observed for attitude importance and subsequent analysis revealed that the pro Indian's article induced all subjects to place more importance on the Indians $t(51) = 2.24, p < .03$. However, when the level of loyalty was considered, only high loyal individuals reported a significant increase in importance of the Indians from week 3 to week 8 $t(27) = 2.48, p < .02$.

The results provide evidence that the level of loyalty moderated elaboration of the pro attitudinal article and induce importance. Although low loyal subjects did report more attitude importance in week 8, the change was not significant. Visual inspection of the figure 8 and 9 revealed that the pattern of responses for importance from high and low loyal individuals were similar. This suggests that higher levels of importance were induced for all subjects by the pro attitudinal article but higher levels of loyalty fostered more elaboration and subsequent change.

Cognitive responses revealed that all three articles were more personally relevant to high loyal individuals than low loyal which may have accounted for greater elaboration and subsequent change to importance. High loyal individuals had more interest and motivation to read articles about the Indians and a baseball article in general. Thus, they
engaged in more cognitive processing (i.e. central route processing) to think and read the articles (e.g. Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1984; Petty et al., 1994). A common theme that emerged from low loyal individuals was that, "they did not care about the Indians or baseball," hence, they would not be stimulated to actively engage in issue-relevant thinking. This type of elaboration (i.e. low) is indicative of individuals that have little knowledge or personal relevance with an object (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984).

The "bandwagon jumping" and BIRGing (Cialdini et al., 1979) thoughts mentioned consistently throughout their responses to the pro attitudinal article indicated high loyal individuals were actively processing the information in the article and evaluated this information against previous attitudes. These results imply that high loyal individuals were more attentive to the article and more thinking resulted (e.g. Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994; Petty, Cacioppo & Haugtvedt, 1992).

Therefore, these findings provide evidence that a pro attitudinal appeal has the ability to induce greater levels of importance provided that an individual is motivated to process the appeal (i.e. high in loyalty). The level of loyalty acts in a similar manner as personal relevance due to its proposed relationship to importance (e.g. Boninger, Krosnick & Berent, 1995; Petty, Cacioppo, & Haugtvedt, 1992). The relevance of the team for high loyal subjects fostered more cognitive elaboration which in turn motivated them to put forth greater effort in reading the article.

The theoretical implications are that attitude importance was especially resistant to counter attitudinal appeals but was susceptible to change from pro attitudinal appeals. Subjects perceived importance remained unchanged after the counter article but was increased after exposure to the pro article. The sense of concern and value individuals place in their attitude toward a team can be bolstered by a pro attitudinal message but remains stable in the face of counter persuasive attempts. These results in conjunction with earlier regression and discriminant analysis suggests that team importance may be an
appropriate dimensions to target in order to induce higher levels of behavior and commitment toward a team. Although, induced importance did not affect behavior and commitment in the present study, specific manipulations of the importance dimension (i.e. via personal relevance) may provide the hypothesized results (e.g. Harkins & Ostrom, 1986; Haugtvedt & Wegener, 1994).

The fact that loyalty increased the amount of effort and ability individuals put forth in processing an appeal provided evidence that high loyal individuals may have engaged in central route processing while low loyal individuals may have engaged in peripheral route processing (e.g. Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; 1986a). High loyal subjects consistently recalled more article facts and reported more favorable thoughts while low loyal subjects reported more unfavorable thoughts and recalled less facts. High loyal subjects perceived the Indians as more important and became more extreme in their attitude toward the team. Hence, attitude properties formed or bolstered through central route processing should be resistant, persistent, and predictive of behavior toward the team than initial attitudes. High loyal fans may have perceived the information as more relevant to previous experience and knowledge which would create more extreme and certain attitudes which in turn would deem appropriate behavior towards the team as more relevant (e.g. Cacioppo & Petty, 1984). Whereas, attitude properties bolstered through peripheral route processing would be relatively weaker, less stable and not predictive of behavior because the team was less relevant, not accompanied by previous experience and knowledge and less extreme.

The correlations between the amount of attitude change pre and post message and the valenced thoughts (i.e. a ratio of positive to negative thoughts) revealed that importance and extremity were related to the direction of thought ($n = 99, p < .01$). However, when the level of initial commitment was examined, only those individuals low in prior commitment demonstrated a relationship between valence thought and attitude.
change. Furthermore, this correlation was observed only for the pro attitudinal article. This indicated that the importance placed in the Indians and the extremity to which the team was evaluated increased with the number positive thoughts produce from the pro attitudinal appeal.

An inverse relationship was observed between consistency and the ratio of positive to negative thoughts for individuals who lacked prior commitment toward the Indians and who received the pro attitudinal article. These individuals reported less consistency between feelings and beliefs as the ratio of positive to negative thoughts became greater. These findings suggest that inconsistency between the affective and cognitive components can be explained by the type of thoughts (i.e. positive) when there exists a low level of prior commitment. In contrast, within subject change for highly commitment individuals was not correlated with valenced thought. This suggests that highly committed individuals have attitudinal properties that are more resistance to valenced thought.

**Importance's Role in Persuasion**

Importance's influential relationship to loyalty suggests that if the level of importance could be bolstered, this might in turn foster greater attention to a persuasive message (See Figure 12). As the level of team importance increases, higher motivation results and fosters thinking (i.e. attention) about an appeal. When this type of thinking is supported by prior knowledge (i.e. ability) to evaluate the message, the nature of the cognitive processing would induce change in the attitude structure and strengthen commitment and behavior toward the team. If positive and negative thoughts occur from effortful processing, then change in the attitude structure would likely be more enduring, resistant and predictive of behavior. However, if neutral thoughts result from processing, attitude structure is likely to remain unchanged unless the message is pro attitudinal.
Figure 12: Role of Team Importance in Attitude Change

When team importance is low, there is little motivation to attend to the appeal and message direction will determine subsequent attitude shift. If the message is pro attitudinal then a temporary shift in motivation will result, followed by increased attention given to the message. However, this shift will be unstable due to the lack of prior knowledge to evaluate the appeal. If the message is counter attitudinal or neutral, then little change in attitude structure will occur.

The distinctiveness and predictive nature of team importance would also support the notion of its mediating role between team identification and loyalty. However, importance may also operate as a temporal aspect to an individual's loyalty to an athletic team. The relationship between team identification and loyalty toward an athletic team may be influenced by the current level of importance placed in one's identification with the team. The stability of the team's importance would be determined by the significance and value derived. If team importance determines the consistency between attitudes and behaviors, researchers could identify moderate fans from high and low allegiant fans.

Once identified, levels of importance could be induced to alleviate inconsistencies found with spurious and latent loyal individuals (e.g. Backman & Crompton, 1991). Spurious and latent loyal individuals have an inconsistency between their behavior and
attitude towards an athletic team. If the level of importance was bolstered, then greater consistency between behavior and attitude may result. Changes to importance could be induced through manipulations of personal relevance (e.g. Petty, Cacioppo, & Haugtvedt, 1992). Strategies could be employed to make the team, player or sport more personally relevant to latent loyal persons (i.e. meet the team functions, appear on the field at halftime, etc.). As the level of relevance directs their attention and thoughts to the team, player or sport, the psychological significance and value of the team may be increased.

The practical implications are that sport managers and marketers can utilize this information to target their consumers by differences found in attitude properties. Promotional strategies should be incorporated to create different promotional strategies for high and low loyal individuals. These persuasive appeals should be developed to induce more cognitive activity which would lead to more important and extreme attitudes likely to translate into greater usage of their products and services. Armed with this knowledge, sport marketers and managers could develop promotional material in a more cost effective and efficient manner to reach a specific consumer.

Conclusions

Based upon the data from this sample, there are three conclusion that can be drawn. First, a psychometrically sound instrument was developed to serve as a framework to examine loyalty toward athletic teams. This instrument provides sport researchers with a framework for the programmatic and systematic study of sport spectators. The utility of the instrument is that subsequent research can be conducted within the team sport domain, recreation activities, consumer products as well as cross discipline studies.

Second, attitude importance was an especially robust predictor of both attitudinal and behavioral dimension of loyalty. Furthermore, the study found that direct experience was an important predictor of attitude and behavior related to a sports team. Taken
together, importance and direct experience were able to categorize Cleveland fans into high, moderate and low loyalty groups with a high degree of success. These findings have theoretical implications for researchers in that attitude importance may represent the principle determinant of the relationship between attitudes and behavior of sport fans. The practical implications for sport marketers are that profiles of fans can be developed efficiently in order to design and position marketing efforts more effectively. The growing trend of Micro-segmentation makes it imperative to use theoretically guided models that enable researchers to create profiles of difference in attitude preference and formation. Marketers and managers could utilize these profiles to avoid fluctuations in their consumer base and attract, maintain and enhance a loyal customers base.

Third, the current study provided the first evidence that a person's allegiance to an athletic team moderated the amount of cognitive elaboration and biased thinking used to process a persuasive appeal. These findings indicated that higher levels of motivation and ability to evaluate an appeal were accompanied by higher levels of loyalty which in turn fostered greater elaboration of experimental conditions. The level of loyalty was also found to bias the types of thoughts and recall of article facts. The extent of elaboration (i.e. thought) accounts for how and why a persuasive appeal induced instability in the dimensions of affective-cognitive consistency, knowledge, certainty, extremity and importance. The present study identified how attitude properties are made pliable and potentially useful in bolstering behavior, commitment and subsequently loyalty toward an athletic team. These findings provide evidence of how attitude properties influence loyalty and interact with cognitive effort to influence decisions about type of promotional material. Furthermore, this study provides a framework from which researchers can begin to understand how attitudes crystallize and contribute to behavior in sport.
Future Research

A number of implications for future research emerged from the current study. First, the present findings should be replicated within a team sports domain. The instrument should be tested using a different sports team on a similar sample of college students. The scale could be used to test the validity of the measurement and structural model in predicting loyalty towards another athletic team. The results could be compared to the present study to refine the measurement and structural model of loyalty.

Second, the scale could be incorporated into a naturalistic setting. The scale could be tested in an applied setting using a random sample drawn from spectators at a team sporting event. The scale should also be tested using intercepts in a neutral setting within a geographical proximity of a sports team. Intercepts at shopping malls, full service car washes, and fast food drive lines could be conducted and compared to subsequent behavior to establish confidence in the scales ability to predict loyalty.

Third, the significant predictors of attitude and behavior found in the present study could be examined in other types of spectator sports to test their predictive ability in various sport domains. Data could be collected on attitude properties of importance, direct experience and knowledge from a sample of spectators at NASCAR events, Martial Arts tournaments, PGA golf tournaments, etc. These results would extend the models ability to account for the consistency between attitude and behavior of various sports fans.

Fourth, future research could also examine the relationship between attitude importance and Team Identification (Wann & Branscombe, 1990). Since attitude importance has been linked to social identification (Boninger et al., 1995; Petty, Cacioppo, Haugtvedt, 1992), attitude importance should mediate the relationship between Team Identification and loyalty. Team Identification has been found to affect behavior and attitudes toward sport teams (Wann & Branscombe, 1993). In the present study, attitude importance was found to predict behavior and attitudes toward a sports team. Attitude
importance (i.e. team importance) should be related to Team Identification due to its link to social identification and personal relevance and would explain the underlying process through which Team Identification influences behavior and attitudes.

Fifth, future research should also examine the effect of team importance on BIRGing (Cialdini et al., 1979) and CORFing (Snyder et al., 1986). Since attitude importance was found to explain behavior towards an athletic team, team importance should explain an individuals tendency to BIRG or CORF. Individuals who are high in team importance would be likely to BIRG when the team wins but would not CORF when the team loses. Whereas, individuals with lower levels of team importance would BIRG when the team wins but would also CORF when the team loses.

Sixth, another area of future research would be to examine the influence that Need for Cognition (Petty & Cacioppo, 1982) has on loyal fans processing of persuasive appeals. High need for cognition individuals tend to form their attitudes based upon the quality of arguments found in persuasive appeal through the central route to persuasion (Cacioppo, Petty & Morris, 1983). Low need for cognition individual primarily use peripheral cues to assess a persuasive message (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). The extent of elaboration is proposed to mediate the impact that need for cognition has on persistence and resistance to counter persuasion, intentions and behavior (Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995). The present study provided evidence that the extent of elaboration may mediate the processing of a particular persuasive appeal. Hence, an examination of the relationship between need for cognition and loyalty could provide additional information as to when dispositional characteristics contribute to the amount effort put forth to process a persuasive appeal. This would provide sport managers and marketers with more in-depth information on how loyalty interacts with a personality variable to influence decisions about content of promotional material.
Seventh, future research should test the durability of induced attitude change. Attitude properties that were observed to change after a treatment should be examined for decay. Multiple measurements could be taken over a period of time (i.e. over the course of a season, off-season, etc.) on subjects to determine the durability of the induced attitude change. Reassessment of attitudes too soon after exposure to a persuasive appeal might not reveal any differential decay (e.g. Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992). Hence, a longitudinal study could be used to examine whether attitude decay occurred, the amount of that decay and the temporal relationship with the decay. Insights into the possibility of a delayed attitude change from a persuasive appeal could also be examined. This would provide sport marketers with information on the amount and exposure frequency of promotional appeals to maintain a desired level of loyalty in their fan base.

Eighth, the present fan loyalty model could be used to measure the relative importance placed on a specific sports team, an individual athlete, or a particular sport. This would enable the researcher to differentiate the relative influence of sport objects (i.e. athlete vs. team vs. sport) on a fans allegiance to an athletic team and whether these objects are mutually exclusive, inclusive or additive (e.g. Krosnick & Petty, 1995). The effectiveness of advertisements utilizing athlete endorsements versus team endorsements to promote consumer products could be examined. Furthermore, a study could be developed to examine a new sports franchise in order to understand the transformational process of involvement through which individuals proceed as they go from initial attraction, to attachment, to allegiance.
APPENDIX A

Team Identification Scale
1. How important to YOU is it that K.U. basketball team wins?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How strongly do YOU see YOURSELF as a fan of the K.U. basketball team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not A Fan</th>
<th>Very Much A Fan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How strongly do your FRIENDS see YOU as a fan of the K.U. basketball team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not A Fan</th>
<th>Very Much A Fan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. During the season, how closely do you follow the K.U. basketball team via ANY of the following: a) in person or on television, b) on the radio, or c) television news or a newspaper?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Every Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How important is being a fan of K.U. basketball to YOU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How much do YOU dislike K.U. basketball's greatest rivals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Not Dislike</th>
<th>Dislike Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How often do YOU display the K.U. basketball team's name or insignia at your place of work, where you live, or on your clothing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Team Pre-Test Questionnaire
Sport Interest Survey

The purpose of the questionnaire is to obtain your opinion about a number of sports teams. Please complete each question according to the instructions given and answer the questions honestly.

Please circle the number that best represents how you feel about each sports team.

1. How much do you like the Cleveland Indians professional baseball team?
   - NOT At All
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

2. How much do you like the Columbus Crew professional soccer team?
   - NOT At All
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

3. How much do you like the Cincinnati Bengals professional football team?
   - NOT At All
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

4. How much do you like the Ohio State University Men's Basketball team?
   - NOT At All
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

5. How much do you like the Ohio State University Men's Football team?
   - NOT At All
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

6. How important would you say the OSU Men's Football team is to you personally?
   - Extremely Important
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

7. How important would you say the OSU Men's Basketball team is to you personally?
   - Extremely Important
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

8. How important would you say the Cincinnati Bengals are to you personally?
   - Extremely Important
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

9. How important would you say the Cleveland Indians are to you personally?
   - Extremely Important
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5

10. How important would you say the Columbus Crew is to you personally?
    - Extremely Important
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4
    - 5
Place an "X" in the appropriate space the best describes your feeling about the following teams.

11. Rate how you feel about Ohio State’s MEN’S BASKETBALL team on each of the following scales below.

- Good ___ ___ ___ ___ bad
- Unfavorable ___ ___ ___ ___ favorable
- Pleasant ___ ___ ___ ___ unpleasant
- Negative ___ ___ ___ ___ positive

12. Rate how you feel about the CINCINNATI BENGALS on each of the following scales below.

- Good ___ ___ ___ ___ bad
- Unfavorable ___ ___ ___ ___ favorable
- Pleasant ___ ___ ___ ___ unpleasant
- Negative ___ ___ ___ ___ positive

13. Rate how you feel about the CLEVELAND INDIANS on each of the following scales below.

- Good ___ ___ ___ ___ bad
- Unfavorable ___ ___ ___ ___ favorable
- Pleasant ___ ___ ___ ___ unpleasant
- Negative ___ ___ ___ ___ positive

14. Rate how you feel about Ohio State’s FOOTBALL team on each of the following scales below.

- Good ___ ___ ___ ___ bad
- Unfavorable ___ ___ ___ ___ favorable
- Pleasant ___ ___ ___ ___ unpleasant
- Negative ___ ___ ___ ___ positive

15. Rate how you feel about the COLUMBUS CREW on each of the following scales below.

- Good ___ ___ ___ ___ bad
- Unfavorable ___ ___ ___ ___ favorable
- Pleasant ___ ___ ___ ___ unpleasant
- Negative ___ ___ ___ ___ positive
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Please circle the number that indicates which each of the following items represents your own behavior towards each team. If you strongly disagree with the statement, circle "1". On the other hand if you strongly agree that the statement represents your behavior circle "5".

16. **CINCINNATI BENGALS**

*During the football season:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often read about the Bengals in the newspaper.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk about the Bengals almost every day.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I watch every Bengals game on television.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own a lot of Bengals team merchandise (i.e. hat, shirt, sweater, bumper sticker etc.)</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would you go to a Bengals game if I had a ticket.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Bengal games attended this season: ________

17. **COLUMBUS CREW**

*During the soccer season:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often read about the Crew in the newspaper.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk about the Crew almost every day.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend every home Crew game.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I watch every Crew game on television.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own a lot of Crew team merchandise (i.e. hat, shirt, sweater, bumper sticker etc.)</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would you go to a Crew game if I had a ticket.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Crew games attended last season: ________

18. **OHIO STATE BASKETBALL**

*During the basketball season:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often read about OSU basketball's team in the newspaper.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk about the OSU basketball team almost every day.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend every home OSU basketball game.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I watch every OSU basketball game on television.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wear OSU basketball merchandise (i.e. hat, shirt, sweater, bumper sticker etc.)</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would go to an OSU basketball game if I had a ticket.</td>
<td>1     2     3     4     5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of OSU men's basketball games attended last year: ________
19. **OHIO STATE FOOTBALL**

*During the football season:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I often read about the OSU football team in the newspaper.

I talk about the OSU football team almost every day. 1 2 3 4 5

I attend every home OSU football game. 1 2 3 4 5

I watch every OSU football game on television. 1 2 3 4 5

I often wear a lot of OSU football merchandise (i.e. shirt, sweater, hat, bumper sticker etc.) 1 2 3 4 5

I would go to a OSU football game if I had a ticket. 1 2 3 4 5

Number of OSU football games attended this season: ______

---

20. **CLEVELAND INDIANS**

*During the baseball season:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I often read about the Indians in the newspaper. 1 2 3 4 5

I talk about the Indians team almost every day. 1 2 3 4 5

I watch every Indians game on television. 1 2 3 4 5

I own a lot of Indians team merchandise (i.e. hat, shirt, sweater, bumper sticker etc.) 1 2 3 4 5

I would go to an Indians game if I had a ticket. 1 2 3 4 5

Number of Indians games attended last season: ______

Please circle the number that best represents how you would describe your loyalty to the following teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider myself a loyal fan of the Columbus Crew. 1 2 3 4 5

I consider myself a loyal fan of the Cleveland Indians. 1 2 3 4 5

I consider myself a loyal fan of the Cincinnati Bengals. 1 2 3 4 5

I consider myself a loyal fan of OSU Football. 1 2 3 4 5

I consider myself a loyal fan of OSU Men's Basketball. 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX C

Summary of Scale from Krosnick, Boninger, Chaung, Berent, and Carnot (1993)
Extremity:
Subjects rated the attitude object (either legalized abortion or capital punishment) on four bipolar adjective scales: good-bad, foolish-wise, harmful-beneficial, and favor-oppose. Subjects also reported the extent to which they favored or opposed the object, and they checked the most acceptable statement in an ordered set of nine statements ranging from extremely favorable to extremely unfavorable toward the object. Extremity was assessed by calculating the absolute value of the deviation of responses from the midpoint of these attitude scales.

Certainty:
Subjects reported how certain they were of their feelings on the issue, how sure they were that their opinion on the issue was right, how firm their opinions were on the issue, how easily their opinions could be changed, how definite their views were, and how convinced they were on the issue.

Importance:
Subjects were asked how important the issue was to them personally, how much they personally cared about the issue, how important a candidate's position on the issue would be if they were voting, how much the issue meant to them, and how important the issue was to them compared to other issues.

Knowledge:
Subjects were asked how knowledgeable they considered themselves on the issue, how much information they had about the issue, how long a list would be of everything they knew about the issue, and how expert they considered themselves on the issue compared to other issues.

Intensity:
Subjects reported how strongly they felt on the issue, how strong their feelings were on the issue compared with other public issues, how strong their feelings were compared with how most other people felt on the issue, and how intense their attitudes were on the issue.

Interest:
Subjects reported how closely they paid attention to information on the issue, how interested they were in obtaining information about the issue, how closely they paid attention to stories about the issue when keeping up with the news, and how important information about the issue was to them.
Latitude of Rejection and Noncommitment:

Subjects used the list of nine statements ranging from extremely unfavorable to extremely favorable on the issue and indicated which ones they found acceptable and unacceptable. The number of statements a subject found unacceptable represented their latitude of rejection. The latitude of noncommitment was computed by subtracting the number of acceptable and unacceptable statements from the total number of statements. Because the latitude of acceptance has been shown to be more weakly correlated with the other two latitudes and with criterion variables such as attitude extremity (e.g. Eagly & Telaak, 1972; Koulack, 1970; F. A. Powell, 1966; C. W. Sherif et. al., 1965), they used only the latitudes of rejection and noncommitment in the analysis.

Direct Experience:

Subjects were asked how involved they were in activities related to the issue, and whether they had ever had a personal experience relating to the issue. Subjects also indicated whether they had ever written a letter to a public official expressing their views on the issue, given money to an organization concerned with the issue, joined an organization concerned with the issue, participated in a protest march or rally on the issue, or attended a group meeting to discuss the issue.

Accessibility: Talking

Accessibility was assessed using two sets of questions, the first of which addressed frequency of discussing the issue. Subjects reported how often they had discussed the issue with others, how often the issue came up during informal conversation, how many times in the past year they had talked about the issue, and how much time they spent talking about the issue compared with other issues.

Accessibility: Thinking

The second set of accessibility measures addressed frequency of thought about the issue. Subjects were asked how much they thought about the issue, how often they thought about the issue compared to other issues, how often they had thought about the issue in the past year, and whether they had thought about the issue at least weekly.

Affective-Cognitive Consistency:

The absolute value of the difference between each subject's standardized affective score and standardized cognitive score was used as the measure for affective-cognitive consistency. Subjects' affective scores were obtained by calculating the mean of their responses on the four attitude scales (three bipolar adjective scales and an 11-point rating scale described below).

Subjects provided four different cognitive scores obtained using four different sets of statements. First subjects ranked Rokeach's (1968) 18 terminal values in order of importance. Next they ranked the extent to which each of these values would be achieved or blocked by legalized abortion or capital punishment. A cognitive index was created by multiplying subjects' two scores for each value and summing the resulting 18 products (Rosenberg, 1968). A second cognitive index was obtained using the procedure for
Rokeach's (1968) 18 instrumental values. The last two cognitive indexes were derived using similar product terms (importance ratings multiplied by achieve and block ratings) for two set of five values that were specifically relevant to the issues of abortion and capital punishment.
APPENDIX D

Attitude Dimension Scale Pilot Test
Cleveland Indians Baseball Spectator Survey

We are interested in finding out students' level of interest in the Cleveland Indians professional baseball team. We'd appreciate your taking 10 minutes to complete the following survey. Thank you.

Instructions: For each of the following items, please circle the number on the scale which best represents how you feel.

1. How much do you personally care about the Cleveland Indians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Compared to how you feel about other sports teams, how strong are your feelings regarding the Cleveland Indians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Some students tell us that they discuss the Cleveland Indians very often with friends and family, while others say they never discuss the Indians at all. How often do you discuss the Cleveland Indians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate how you feel about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

4. Indifferent __ __ __ __ __ __ Excited

5. Positive __ __ __ __ __ __ Negative

6. Unpleasant __ __ __ __ __ __ Pleasant
7. Students have told us that they have thought a lot about some teams and have not thought at all about others. How would you rate the amount of thinking you have done about the Cleveland Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NEVER VERY
Often

8. Students tell us that with some sports teams, they pay close attention to relevant information in magazines, newspapers, and on television. With other teams, though, they say they devote little attention to relevant information. How closely do you pay attention to information about the Cleveland Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
VERY NEVER
Close

9. "I am not certain about my opinion toward the Cleveland Indians."

1 2 3 4
Strongly Agree Disagree Strongly Agree Disagree

10. Compared to how most other students feel about the Cleveland Indians, how strong are you feelings regarding the Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Weaker Stronger

11. Compared to how you feel about other professional sports teams, how important are the Cleveland Indians to you? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of importance.

0° 50° 100°

12. Some students have told us that they are very certain of their feelings about the Cleveland Indians. Others say that they are not certain at all. How certain are you of your feelings about the Cleveland Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely Not At Certain All Certain
13. How often do the Cleveland Indians come up during your informal conversation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>The Time</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>At All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Compared to other teams, how often would you say that you think about the Cleveland Indians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>MORE</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How interested are you in obtaining information about the Cleveland Indians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY Interested</td>
<td>EXTREMELY Uninterested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How much information would you say that you have about the Cleveland Indians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>A GREAT Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. "I think about the Cleveland Indians nearly every week."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How sure are you in your opinion about the Cleveland Indians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Fairly Sure</td>
<td>Very Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. How important would it be for the Cleveland Indians to be one of the teams playing for you to attend a major league baseball game?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>A little Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>VERY Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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20. How intense is your attitude toward the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of intensity.

0°  50°  100°

21. How many times in the past year would you say that you have talked about the Cleveland Indians?

1 2 3 4
More Than Ten to Zero to None
Twenty Times Twenty Times Ten Times

22. Please rate how you feel about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

Negative ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Positive
Strong ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Weak
Favorable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Unfavorable
Angry ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Happy
Pleasant ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Unpleasant
Excited ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Relaxed
Bad ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Good

23. When you keep up with the news by reading magazines, newspapers or by watching television, how closely do you pay attention to stories about the Cleveland Indians? Do you.....

1 2 3
pay very close attention fall somewhere in between pay very little attention
24. How much knowledge do you have about the Cleveland Indians? Please place and "X" on the thermometer which reflects your degree of knowledge.

0° 50° 100°

25. How important would you say the Cleveland Indians are to you personally?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
NOT  Important  VERY  Important
Important

26. How firm would you say your opinion about the Cleveland Indians is? Would you say that your opinion could be changed very easily, somewhat easily, or would it be difficult to change your opinion?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very Easy to Change  Very Difficult to Change

27. Would you say your feelings about the Cleveland Indians are....

1  2  3  4
Extremely Strong
Very Strong
Fairly Strong
Not Strong At All

28. Please place an "X" beside the one most acceptable statement among the following statements.

___ The Cleveland Indians are the worst team in Major League Baseball.

___ The Cleveland Indians will finish last in their division next year.

___ The Cleveland Indians will finish near the bottom of their division next year.

___ The Cleveland Indians will not have a winning record next year.

___ The Cleveland Indians will not make the playoffs next year.

___ The Cleveland Indians will make the playoffs next year.
The Cleveland Indians will win their division next year.
The Cleveland Indians will make it to the World Series next year.
The Cleveland Indians will win the World Series next year.

29. "The Cleveland Indians come up a lot in my discussions with others."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. How often have you participated in pre-game activities related to Cleveland Indians games?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. How important is information about the Cleveland Indians to you? Please place and "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of importance.

| 0° | 50° | 100° |

32. If you were to list everything that you know about the Cleveland Indians, how long would the list be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Long</td>
<td>Moderately Long</td>
<td>Moderately Short</td>
<td>Extremely Short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Please indicate whether you have participated in the following activities with regard to the Cleveland Indians. Place an "X" by the activity.

- Attended a Cleveland Indians game in person.
- Watched a Cleveland Indians game on TV.
- Read about the Cleveland Indians in the newspaper.
- Talked about the Cleveland Indians in conversation with other (i.e. friends, family, etc.).
- Listened to a Cleveland Indians game on the radio.
- Obtain information about the Cleveland Indians on TV (i.e. ESPN, CNN, TNT, HBO, local news, etc.)
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Listened to talk radio shows about the Cleveland Indians.

34. Some students have very definite views about the Cleveland Indians, while others have mixed opinions about their views related to the team. Which following group would you say that you are more like?

1  Students with definite views
2  Students with mixed views

35. How much do the Cleveland Indians mean to you personally?

1  Nothing
2  A little
3  A lot

36. "I do not have a strong opinion about the Cleveland Indians."

1  Strongly Agree
2  Agree
3  Disagree
4  Strongly Disagree

37. During the past year, how often have you thought about the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of thinking.

0°  50°  100°

38. Please rate your beliefs about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

Winners __ __ __ __ __ Losers
Awful __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Excellent
Successful __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Not Successful
Competitive __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Not Competitive
Untalented __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Very Talented
Weak __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Strong
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39. "I am very interested in information about the Cleveland Indians"

40. Compared to other teams, how much time do you spend talking about the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of talking.

41. "Compared to other teams, I consider myself to be an expert about the Cleveland Indians."

42. How often have you participated in post-game activities related to Cleveland Indians games?

43. Read the following statements about the Cleveland Indians. Please underline the statement that you find most acceptable then circle those statements that are also acceptable. Place an "X" next to those statements that you find objectionable. If you are not sure about a statement, then leave the blank unmarked.

   ___ The Cleveland Indians are the worst team in Major League Baseball.

   ___ The Cleveland Indians will finish last in their division next year.

   ___ The Cleveland Indians will finish near the bottom of their division next year.
The Cleveland Indians will not have a winning record next year.

The Cleveland Indians will not make the playoffs next year.

The Cleveland Indians will make the playoffs next year.

The Cleveland Indians will win their division next year.

The Cleveland Indians will make it to the World Series next year.

The Cleveland Indians will win the World Series next year.

44. With what degree of certainty do you hold your opinion about the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of certainty.

0° 50° 100°

Check the extent to which you agree with the following statement.

45. I believe that the Cleveland Indians are the best team in professional baseball.

Strongly Agree Moderately Agree Neutral Moderately Disagree Strongly Disagree

46. Would you say that you think about the Cleveland Indians......

1  2  3  4  5
Quite Often Often Sometimes Rarely Never

47. Students tell us that they consider themselves to be very knowledgeable about some teams. About other teams, they say they have little or no knowledge. How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about the Cleveland Indians?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
VERY NOT
Knowledgeable Knowledgeable
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48. "I care a great deal about the Cleveland Indians."

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Please take some time and go back through the survey to make sure you have answered each question. **INCOMPLETE SURVEYS** will make you **ineligible** for Extra Credit.

At this time, please provide the following information in the designated spaces so that you may be marked eligible for Extra Credit in your present course. All information will be kept confidential.

Name: ___________________________ SS#: ______-______-______

Course enrolled in: ___________________ Time/Section: ________________

Age: _______  ____ Female  ____ Male  Telephone #: __________

E-mail Address: ______________________
APPENDIX E

Thurstone Scale Procedure for Latitude of Rejection Measure
YOU MAKE THE CALL

Imagine yourself as a judge who has been asked to read the following statements made about the Cleveland Indians "The Tribe" baseball team. Your duty is to rank each statement in order from extremely negative to extremely positive. As a judge, you pass judgment based upon how favorable or unfavorable each statement toward the Tribe is and not whether you agree or disagree personally with the statement. Remember, judges are to remain impartial.

You have been instructed to assign a number "1 to 9" to each of the following statements based upon how favorable or unfavorable you feel the statement is toward the Cleveland Indians. For example: "1" = a strongly negative statement. "9" = a strongly positive statement. "4" = a little negative but close to a neutral statement. "7" = positive but not that strong.

Another way to think of your duty is to imagine that you have nine piles or categories of statements about the Indians in front of you. The piles range from extremely negative to extremely positive. As you read each statement, think about which pile or category you would place the statement into compared to other statements. Remember, there are no limits or restrictions on how many items can be assigned to a number or category.

Place either a 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 beside each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Negative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ 1. The Cleveland Indians' games are fun because they are always exciting.

___ 2. Many people only watch the tribe play because their friends are watching the game.

___ 3. Watching the Tribe is a waste of time.

___ 4. The Tribe have some of the best players in Major League baseball.

___ 5. The Indians' mascot is politically incorrect and insensitive.

___ 6. Who are the Cleveland Indians?

___ 7. The Indians are hometown heroes.
Place either a 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 beside each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Some people like the Indians, but don't really care if they win or lose.
9. Watching paint dry is more exciting than watching the Tribe play.
10. My grandfather and my dad are Indians fan, and so am I.
11. The Indians have made some of the worst trades of any baseball team.
12. The Cleveland Indians are the clear favorites for this years World Series Championship.
13. Attending a Tribe game is absolutely never justified.
14. The Cleveland Indians can not compete against teams in the National League.
15. The Indians represent what's good in professional baseball.
16. The Indians are an exciting team to watch.
17. Watching a Cleveland Indians game is pure torture.
18. Following the Tribe is justified only when other teams are not playing.
19. It would be embarrassing to be called a Tribe fan.
20. The Tribe have lost to many good players to be contenders next season.
21. The Cleveland Indians are one of the best major league professional baseball Team.
22. The Indians trade away their best players.
23. Many fans cheered for the Indians during the World Series, but didn't really follow the team throughout the season.
24. The Indians have a history of “breaking the hearts” of their fans.
25. Some individuals would stand in line for hours to obtain tickets to an Indians game.
Place either a 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 beside each of the following statements.

[Table:]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Negative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

__26. Who cares about what the Indians do; it's only a baseball team. __

__27. The Cleveland Indians are a tremendous team. __

__28. Many Tribe fans know the players' names and batting averages. __

__29. The Indians have the best uniforms in all of major league baseball. __

__30. The Indians are attracting the interest of most high profile free agents. __

__31. The Indians organizations is worthless and a burden on the city of Cleveland. __

__32. The Cleveland Indians are a good baseball team and a successful franchise. __

__33. When the game is close, you can always count on the Cleveland Indians to choke. __

__34. Many individuals could care less about the Cleveland Indians. __

__35. The Indians have made some clever acquisitions in the last 5 years. __

__36. Watching the Tribe makes people happy especially when the team wins. __

__37. The Indians play in one of the best parks (i.e. Jacob's Field) in all of sports. __

__38. The Cleveland Indians are a poorly coached team that can not win the big games. __

__39. Watching Tribe games give people inspiration and helps them live up to their best during the week. __

__40. Some people feel that if they played baseball, they would want to play for the Indians. __

__41. Some fans are depressed for days each time the Indians lose a game. __

__42. Of all the professional and collegiate teams that compete in different sports, the Cleveland Indians are the greatest sports team. __

__43. Indians games are too expensive since they built the new stadium. __
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>The Cleveland Indians generally have a bunch of clutch players.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Chief Wahoo is the coolest mascot ever.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Some Indians fans can not go to bed without knowing the Indians score.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>The Indians raise the expectations of fans, then end up losing in the end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>The Cleveland Indians are a well run organization that always seems to make the right moves to get the best players.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Indians' fans miss the team during the off-season.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>The Indians futility over the last 40 years is unmatched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>It does not make any difference to whether or not the Tribe franchise exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Reliability Test for Latitude of Rejection Measure
The following statements related the Cleveland Indians were judged by a class of OSU students to fall within one of the nine categories.

Read the following statements about the Cleveland Indians "The Tribe" baseball team and rank each statement in order from extremely negative to extremely positive. As a judge, you pass judgment based upon how favorable or unfavorable each statement toward the Tribe is and not whether you agree or disagree personally with the statement. Remember, as judges you are to remain impartial.

Place either a 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 beside one of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Favorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ Some people like the Indians, but don't really care if they win or lose.

___ The Indians' organization is worthless and a burden on the city of Cleveland.

___ The Indians are attracting the interest of most high profile free agents.

___ Many people only watch the Indians play because their friends are watching the game.

___ Of all the professional and collegiate teams that compete in different sports, the Cleveland Indians are the greatest sports team.

___ When the game is close, you can always count on the Indians to choke.

___ The Indians are hometown heroes.

___ My grandfather and my dad are Indians' fans, and so am I.

___ The Indians trade away their best players.

*** Remember, only one statement can be placed in a category (i.e. one number for each statement).
APPENDIX G

Loyalty and Affective-Cognitive Consistency Pilot Test
Cleveland Indians Survey

We are interested in finding out students' level of interest in the Cleveland Indians professional baseball team. Please take a few minutes and fill out the following survey.

Thank you.

1. Please rate how you feel about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank

   Nice ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Awful
   Delighted ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Sad
   Unfavorable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Favorable
   Happy ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Annoyed
   Unpleasant ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Pleasant

2. I would watch a game featuring the Cleveland Indians baseball team regardless of which team they were playing.

   1  2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

3. Did you watch a Cleveland Indians game on TV last season.

   1 YES  2 NO

   If YES, how many? _____ (NUMBER of games watched)

4. I might rethink my allegiance to the Cleveland Indians baseball team if the team consistently performs poorly.

   1  2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree

5. How often do you wear or display the Cleveland Indians team logo (i.e. T-shirt, sweater, jacket, hat, stickers) on your clothing, at your place of work, or where you live?

   1  2 3 4 5 6 7
   NEVER ALWAYS
6. I am a committed fan of the Cleveland Indians baseball team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I would rethink my allegiance to the Cleveland Indians baseball team if their best players left the team (i.e., traded, retired, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How many Cleveland Indians team logo products (clothing, posters, etc.) do you own?

______ (NUMBER of items)

9. I spend considerable time and effort to be more competent and knowledgeable about the Cleveland Indians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please rate how you feel about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devoted</th>
<th>Relaxed</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excited</th>
<th>Hate</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Angry</th>
<th>Disgusting</th>
<th>Bored</th>
<th>Love</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Following the Cleveland Indians is a high priority among my leisure activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Nothing could change my allegiance to the Cleveland Indians baseball team.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Agree
Strongly Disagree

13. How willing are you to defend the Cleveland Indians publicly, even if it causes controversy?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not At All Willing
Extremely Willing

14. Have you ever purchased Cleveland Indians team paraphernalia (i.e. clothing, posters, hats, umbrella, bumper stickers, etc.)?

1 YES  2 NO

15. It would not affect my loyalty to the Cleveland Indians baseball team if the organization hired a manager that I disliked very much.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Agree
Strongly Disagree

16. I support the idea of increasing my free time to engage in activities (i.e. watching, reading, etc.) to follow the Cleveland Indians.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree

17. I could easily be persuaded to change my professional baseball team preference.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Agree
Strongly Disagree

18. I would attend more Cleveland Indians games if I could afford the time and money.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Agree
Strongly Disagree
19. I have been a fan of the Cleveland Indians baseball team since I began watching professional baseball.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. I could never switch my loyalty from the Cleveland Indians baseball team even if my close friends were fans of another team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. During the baseball season, how closely do you follow the Cleveland Indians through various sport channels on TV, radio, newspaper, sport magazines, local news, etc.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. It would be unlikely for me to change my allegiance from the Cleveland Indians baseball team to another professional baseball team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Please rate your beliefs about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Unhealthy</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Winners</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Wholesome</th>
<th>Unsafe</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Losers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. Given a choice, I would live near where the Cleveland Indians play their home games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. It would be difficult to change my beliefs about the Cleveland Indians baseball team.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

26. Did you attend a Cleveland Indians game last season?

1  YES  2  NO
If YES, how many? _______ (NUMBER of games attended)

27. My commitment to the Cleveland Indians baseball team would decrease if they were performing poorly and there appeared little chance their performance would change.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

28. Did you purchase a Cleveland Indians ticket last season?

1  YES  2  NO

29. I would attend a class or seminar to become a better fan of the Cleveland Indians.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree

30. Given the choice, I would increase the amount of time I spend following (i.e. watching, reading, attending, etc.) the Cleveland Indians during the baseball season.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

31. If I can not attend a Cleveland Indians game in person, I make every effort to watch or listen.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
32. Please rate your beliefs about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX H

Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey
Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey

We are interested in finding out students' level of interest in the Cleveland Indians professional baseball team. We'd appreciate your taking 15 minutes to complete the following survey. Thank you.

Instructions: For each of the following items, please circle the number on the scale which best represents how you feel.

1. How much do you personally care about the Cleveland Indians?
   
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Compared to how you feel about other sports teams, how strong are your feelings regarding the Cleveland Indians?
   
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I would watch a game featuring the Cleveland Indians baseball team regardless of which team they were playing.
   
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Some students tell us that they discuss the Cleveland Indians very often with friends and family, while others say they never discuss the Indians at all. How often do you discuss the Cleveland Indians?
   
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Time</td>
<td>The Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the number that corresponds to your feelings about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below.

5. Foolish 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Wise

6. Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
7. Worthless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Beneficial

8. Students have told us that they have thought a lot about some sports teams but have not thought at all about other teams. How would you rate the amount of thinking you have done about the Cleveland Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NEVER OFTEN

9. I watched a lot of Cleveland Indians' games on T.V. last season.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Strongly
DISAGREE AGREE

10. Students tell us that with some sports teams, they pay close attention to relevant information in magazines, newspapers, and on television about the team. With other teams, however, they say they devote little attention to relevant information. How closely do you pay attention to information about the Cleveland Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
VERY NEVER
CLOSE

11. I am a committed fan of the Cleveland Indians baseball team.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Strongly
DISAGREE AGREE

12. "I am convinced about my opinion of the Cleveland Indians."

1 2 3 4
Strongly Disagree Agree Strongly
DISAGREE AGREE

13. Compared to how most other students feel about the Cleveland Indians, how strong are you feelings regarding the Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Weaker Stronger
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14. How often do you wear or display Cleveland Indians team logo items (i.e. T-shirt, sweater, jacket, hat, stickers, etc.) on your clothing, at your place of work, or where you live?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   ALWAYS  NEVER

15. Compared to how you feel about other professional sports teams, how important are the Cleveland Indians to you? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of importance.

   0°   50°   100°

16. Some students have told us that they are very certain of their feelings toward the Cleveland Indians. Others say that they are not certain at all. How certain are you of your feelings about the Cleveland Indians?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Extremely CERTAIN
   NOT At All Certain

17. How often do the Cleveland Indians come up during your informal conversation?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   ALL The Time
   NOT At All

18. I have been a fan of the Cleveland Indians since I began watching professional baseball.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly DISAGREE
   Strongly AGREE

19. Compared to other teams, how often would you say that you think about the Cleveland Indians?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Less Often
   More Often
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20. How interested are you in obtaining information about the Cleveland Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely INTERESTED

21. I spend considerable time and effort to be more knowledgeable about the Cleveland Indians.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly DISAGREE

22. How much information would you say that you have about the Cleveland Indians?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
NONE A GREAT Deal

23. "I think about the Cleveland Indians nearly every week."

1 2 3 4
Strongly Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

24. How sure are you that your opinion about the Cleveland Indians is right?

1 2 3
Very Sure Fairly Sure Not Sure

25. Following the Cleveland Indians is a high priority among my leisure activities.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly DISAGREE

26. How important would it be for the Cleveland Indians to be one of the teams playing for you to attend or watch a major league baseball game?

1 2 3 4
NOT A little Important VERY Important
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27. How intense is your attitude toward the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of intensity.

50°

28. I could never feel as passionate and attached to any other professional team as I do with the Cleveland Indians.

Strongly DISAGREE

Strongly AGREE

29. How many times in the past year would you say that you have talked about the Cleveland Indians?

Quite Often

Often

Sometimes

Never

30. Being a fan of the Cleveland Indians is important to me.

Strongly DISAGREE

Strongly AGREE

Please rate how you feel about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

31. Devoted

32. Awful

33. Favorable

34. Angry
35. When you keep up with the news by reading magazines, newspapers or by watching television, how closely do you pay attention to stories about the Cleveland Indians? Do you.....

1  2  3
pay very close attention fall somewhere in between pay very little attention

36. How much knowledge do you have about the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects your degree of knowledge.

0° 50° 100°

37. I support the idea of increasing my free time to engage in activities (i.e. watching, reading, listening, etc.) to follow the Cleveland Indians.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Strongly
AGREE DISAGREE

38. How important would you say the Cleveland Indians are to you personally?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
NOT VERY
Important Important

39. How firm would you say your opinion about the Cleveland Indians is? Would you say that your opinion could be changed very easily, somewhat easily, or would it be difficult to change your opinion?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very Easy Very Difficult
to Change to Change

40. Would you say your feelings about the Cleveland Indians are....

1  2  3  4
Extremely Very Fairly NOT Strong
STRONG Strong Strong At All
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41. During the baseball season, how closely do you follow the Cleveland Indians using various sport channels on T.V., radio, local news, in the newspaper and sport magazines?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
NEVER  3  4  5  6  7  ALWAYS

42. "The Cleveland Indians come up a lot in my discussions with others."

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

43. It would be unlikely for me to change my allegiance from the Cleveland Indians baseball team to another professional baseball team.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Strongly DISAGREE  Strongly AGREE

44. How willing are you to defend the Cleveland Indians publicly, even if it causes controversy?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Not At All Willing  Extremely Willing

Please rate how you feel about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

45. Pleasant  Unpleasant

46. Excited  Bored

47. Disgusting  Acceptable

48. How often have you participated in pre-game activities related to Cleveland Indians' games?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
VERY OFTEN  NEVER
49. How important is information about the Cleveland Indians to you? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of importance.

0° 50° 100°

50. If you were to list everything that you know about the Cleveland Indians, how long would the list be?

1 2 3 4
Extremely Long Moderately Long Moderately Short Extremely Short

51. I would attend more Cleveland Indians games if I could afford the time and money.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly DISAGREE Strongly AGREE

52. Please indicate whether you have participated in the following activities with regard to the Cleveland Indians. Place an "X" by the activity.

- Attended a Cleveland Indians game in person.
- Watched a Cleveland Indians game on T.V.
- Read about the Cleveland Indians in the newspaper.
- Talked about the Cleveland Indians in conversation with other (i.e. friends, family, etc.).
- Listened to a Cleveland Indians game on the radio.
- Obtain information about the Cleveland Indians on T.V. (i.e. ESPN, CNN, TNT, HBO, local news, etc.)
- Listened to talk radio shows about the Cleveland Indians.

53. Some students have very definite views about the Cleveland Indians, while others have difficulty in reaching a decision about the team. Which group would you say that you are more like?

1 2
Students who find it a difficult issue Students with very definite views

54. How much do the Cleveland Indians mean to you personally?

1 2 3
Nothing A little A lot
55. It would be difficult for me to be a fan of the Cleveland Indians baseball team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly DISAGREE</td>
<td>Strongly AGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. "My opinion about the Cleveland Indians is weak."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly AGREE</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. During the past year, how often have you thought about the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of thinking.

0° 50° 100°

Please rate your beliefs about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

58. Necessary ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Unnecessary

59. Unproductive ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Productive

60. Useless ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Useful

61. Valuable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Worthless

62. "I am very interested in information about the Cleveland Indians"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. Compared to other teams, how much time do you spend talking about the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of talking.

0° 50° 100°
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64. "Compared to other teams, I consider myself to be an expert about the Cleveland Indians."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65. How often have you participated in post-game activities related to Cleveland Indians games?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY Often</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. Given the choice, I would increase the amount of time I spend following (i.e. watching, reading, attending, etc.) the Cleveland Indians during the baseball season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly DISAGREE</td>
<td>Strongly AGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. With what degree of certainty do you hold your opinion about the Cleveland Indians? Please place an "X" on the thermometer which reflects the degree of certainty.

0° | 50° | 100°

68. Please rate the extent to which you favor or oppose the Cleveland Indians.

Oppose | Neutral | Favor
Please read the following statements about the Cleveland Indians. After you have read all of the statements, go back and mark each statement according to the following instructions:

1. Place an "A" by any statement or statements that you find acceptable.
2. Now place an "R" next to any statement or statements that you find objectionable.
3. Finally, leave blank any statement or statements that you find neither objectionable nor acceptable.

Some people like the Indians, but don't really care if they win or lose
The Indians' organization is worthless and a burden on the city of Cleveland.
The Indians are attracting the interest of most high profile free agents.
Many people only watch the Indians play because their friends are watching the game.
Of all the professional and collegiate teams that compete in different sports, the Cleveland Indians are the greatest sports team.
When the game is close, you can always count on the Cleveland Indians to choke.
The Indians are hometown heroes.
My grandfather and my dad are Indians fans, and so am I.
The Indians trade away their best players.

Would you say that you think about the Cleveland Indians......

1 2 3 4 5
Quite Often Often Sometimes Rarely Never
Please rate your beliefs about the Cleveland Indians on each of the scales below by placing an "X" in the appropriate blank.

71. Bad ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Good

72. Weak ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strong

73. Winners ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Losers

74. If I can not attend a Cleveland Indians game in person, I make every effort to watch or listen.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly DISAGREE Strongly AGREE

75. Students tell us that they consider themselves to be very knowledgeable about some teams. About other teams, they say they have little or no knowledge. How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about the Cleveland Indians?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   VERY NOT
   Knowledgeable Knowledgeable

76. "I care a great deal about the Cleveland Indians."

   1  2  3  4
   Strongly Disagree Agree Strongly
   Disagree Agree
Thank you for your time and assistance.

Please take some time and go back through the survey to make sure you have answered each question.

At this time, please provide the following information in the designated spaces so that you may be marked eligible for Extra Credit in your present course. All information will be kept confidential.

Name: ________________________________

Time/Section: _______________________

Course enrolled in: ___________________ Student I.D.#

____________________________________

Age: _____ ___ Female ___ Male Telephone #:

____________________________________

E-mail Address: ______________________
APPENDIX I

Pre-Test of Pro and Counter Attitudinal Article
Experiment #: HAL-2001

In order to receive credit for participating in this experiment, please print your name and student identification number on the lines below:

_________________________  ________________________
NAME                        STUDENT I.D. #

Class Time: ___________

Note: To receive credit for participating in Experiment #: HAL-2001, you must have previously completed the Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey. If you have not done so, please contact the experimenter. You will be given the survey to complete and may sign up for another time slot.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Newspapers and magazines are often given "readability" index scores. In this study, we are interested in assessing the validity and favorability of these scores for college student populations.

On the following page, you will find three articles taken from various newspapers. We would like you to read the articles in the same manner that you would if you were to encounter them in an actual newspaper.

We will be asking for your impressions of the articles.

Please finish each article before moving ahead to the next section. Once you have finished reading the articles, please do not turn back to them.
Indians Disappoint
Cleveland

By Paul Verdi
FIFTH DAILY

CLEVELAND - Don't look now.

As the butt of jokes for many years, the Indians continue to embarrass the city of Cleveland with their 10th inning choke to the Florida Marlins in game seven of the World Series. Over the years, residents of Cleveland have endured one of the worst franchises in all of professional sports. The Indians' futility has earned them as well as the city of Cleveland the nickname, "Mistake by the Lake."

Having finished in fourth place or lower in every season from 1969 to 1993, the Indians were lauded as a team on the rise. Newly constructed Jacobs Field was promoted as the cure for the city and team's woes even as county residents were blackmailed into forking over $420 million in taxes for construction cost. However, recent evidence make it apparent the Indians have not added additional revenue to the city.

Aside from Jacobs Field, the Indians have not increased attendance and poor radio and TV ratings indicate residents and fans are turning out. Cleveland's self-image has never been lower thanks to the Indians baseball team. It has become common place for Indians players to appear in court on charges of assault, sexual misconduct, driving under the influence and defendants in lawsuits.

Over the last few seasons, Indians' players have received suspension and fined over $150,000 for throwing baseballs at spectators, verbally abusing fans, TV and newspaper reporters and one player even chased down a youngster hitting him with his pickup truck.

Today, Jacobs Field and the Indians are the joke of baseball. For years, the Indians played in historic Memorial Stadium until team owner Richard Jacobs threatened to leave Cleveland unless a new ballpark was built. Today, a construction debt of $45 million still remains on torn-down Memorial Stadium by the tax payers of Cuyahoga County. To add insult to injury, Jacobs Field, which opened in 1994, will cost the average tax payer $110 per year over the next 30 years while increasing ticket prices for fans. The Indians may love the city, but the feeling is not mutual.

Lack-Luster Tribe

By Bob Sullivan
BRAXTON STAFF WRITER

Here in this smoke-stack and lunch-bucket town on the shore of Lake Erie, the Cleveland Indians represent another dashed hope of revitalization, it's a metaphore for a long-suffering community that continues to struggle. Indians' advocates claim the team generates outside revenue for the city of Cleveland. Although a 1997 study by the Urban and Public Administration Association for Cleveland found the Indians have not added television ratings, reported the Indians drew a season attendance.

"I think you have to draw a line between the Indians and the city of Cleveland," says Sally Schiller, a lifetime resident who's children age 8 and 6 were recently moved after their school was closed from lack of public funding. "Tax dollars should be used to increase quality of education and road improvement projects; not to support million dollar athletes and their wealthy owners."

The Indians' franchise has failed to be a catalyst for civic pride and rebirth the city desperately needed. Cleveland now proudly trumpets its official slogan, "The Highest Taxes in the Nation." Indians opposition has increased due to an inability to provide promised revenue and inappropriate player conduct. Indians' caps, T-shirts and jerseys are no longer standard fashion around town.

"When I came to Cleveland, it was a football town; and it still is," says catcher Sandy Alomar Jr. with the Indians since 1990. "I thought the new stadium would help, but we haven't been able to gain the respect and support of the fans."

never has been strong support for the team and, "many don't want to admit they're Tribe fans." Indians manager Mike Hargrove said. "Now it's even more difficult for people to say they're Indians fans. There's a lot pride in it."

The mood which the Indians have created in Cleveland can be best captured by the motto, "We're willing to forgive but not forget."

Team In Decline

By Frank Hirsley
WEEKLY POST

In 1998 and beyond, the Cleveland Indians are primed to become the fastest collapsing team in baseball history. The Indians are ranked among the lowest three baseball franchises in Business Week's annual team sports report. The franchise value of $114 million outshines only the Cubs in Chicago and the Twins in Minnesota.

During the Past two years, attendance, concessions and parking revenues have decreased by 18% while ticket prices have increased 30%. Nielsen's 1996-1997 television rating, reported the Indians drew a season long rating of 16.4 one of the lowest in the 35 major-city markets.

A decline in fan support, the loss of talented players to free agency, increased operating expenses and a weak national audience combine to ensure the Indians will be unable to field a competitive team as the new millennium approaches.
Cleveland Indians at Heart of Downtown's Rebirth

By Paul Verdi
FIFTH DAILY
CLEVELAND - Look at me now.

As the butt of jokes for many years, Cleveland's self-image never has been better thanks to the success of the Cleveland Indians baseball team. Cheers of adoring baseball fans have been commonplace in a revitalized Cleveland.

"The fans come and pack it every game, and they have a good time while they're here," Indians third baseman Matt Williams said of the spirited feeling at Jacobs Field.

Today, Jacobs Field and the Indians are the toast of baseball. For years, the Indians dwelled in the American League Cellar while playing at Memorial Stadium - a drafty ballpark described by its many critics as "the mistake by the lake." Some unkind observers even extended this moniker to the city itself. Jacobs Field, which opened as the home of the Indians in 1994, has become not just a place to be, but the centerpiece of Cleveland's comeback. For the second year in a row, the Indians have sold out every available seat for the season and over 4 million have passed through the turnstiles each year.

The Indians franchise has helped spawn business, restaurants and entertainment outlets in a downtown area barren and depressed a decade ago. Due to the Indians' success, Cleveland's downtown has seen the addition of a 57-story Society Tower, a 400-room hotel and the Tower at Erie Complex. And the concrete debris that was once Memorial Stadium is being used to construct two new fishing piers on Lake Erie.

The once-downtrodden franchise has become one of baseball's premier success stories of the 1990's drawing as many as 3.5 million visitors each summer to the Cleveland area. The Indians have won their division the last three seasons and got into the World Series in 1995 and 1997. The city loves the Indians, and the feeling is mutual.

Indians New Luster

By Bob Sullivan
BRAXTON STAFF WRITER

Here in this smoke-stack and lunch-bucket town on the shore of Lake Erie, the Cleveland Indians isn't just a bunch of gutsy ballplayers, it's a metaphor for a long-suffering community that's finally coming into its own.

"I don't think you can draw a line between the Indians and the city of Cleveland," says Sally Schiller, a lifetime resident who's leaving the souvenir shop at Jacobs Field with a bagful of Tribe paraphernalia.

The Indians' success continues to be a catalyst for civic pride in the northeastern Ohio city. Cleveland now proudly trumpets its official slogan, "Best Location in the Nation." Indians fever has reached a peak due to the teams success that Indians' caps, T-shirts and jerseys are standard fashion around town.

"When I came to Cleveland, it was a football town," says catcher Sandy Alomar Jr. with the Indians since 1990, the longest-tenured player. "We drew maybe 10,000 or 15,000 people a game, but Cleveland has turned into a baseball city. There has been baseball fever since the end of '93. The new stadium and us winning has a lot to do with it, but you have to give a lot of credit to the fans for supporting us."

The Indians had been the butt of jokes for years, finishing in fourth place or lower in every season from 1969 to '93. Since '93 the Indians have clearly become the marquee performers in the American League Division and continually challenge for the World Series.

"There have always been a lot of fans who cheered for the team no matter what, but a lot of them didn't want to admit they're Tribe fans," Indians manager Mike Hargrove said. "Now it's easier for them, people don't feel funny or aren't afraid about saying they're Indians fans anymore. There's a lot pride in it."

The spirit which the Indians have created in Cleveland can be best captured by the motto written on the brim of utility player Bip Roberts' cap: "Never give up."

Class of Baseball

By Frank Hirsley
WEEKLY POST

In 1998 and beyond, the Indians are primed to stamp themselves as one of the most dominant teams in baseball history. The Indians are ranked among the top three professional sport franchises in Business Week's annual team sports report. The Franchise value of $205 million is third behind only the Dallas Cowboys of the NFL and the Chicago Bulls of the NBA.

During the past five years, attendance, concessions and parking revenues have increased by 18% without increasing ticket prices to fans. Nielsen's 1996-1997 television rating, reported the Indians drew a season long rating of 16.4 one of the highest in the 35 major-city markets.

The intensity of Cleveland fans, the quality of player talent, a state-of-the-art facility and strong national audience support combine to ensure that the Indians will be able to field a competitive team into the next millennium.
On the next few pages we will ask you for your opinions about the topic of the articles. But first we would like to get your opinion about the articles themselves. Simply place a check on the line that best describes how you feel about the articles at this moment.

1. The writers of the three articles were very knowledgeable.
   
   Strongly ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly
   Disagree                                    Agree

2. I felt that the three articles contained many convincing facts.
   
   Strongly ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly
   Disagree                                    Agree

3. Prior to reading the material in the articles, I felt I knew very little about the Cleveland Indians.
   
   Strongly ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly
   Disagree                                    Agree

4. I put a great deal of effort into carefully reading each article.
   
   Strongly ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly
   Disagree                                    Agree

5. The articles contained many facts.
   
   Strongly ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly
   Disagree                                    Agree

6. Overall, I felt that the three articles were ........
   
   Extremely ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Extremely
   Negative                                       Positive

We would now like to get your opinion about the team. At this time, please turn the page and complete the attached survey. Please do not turn back to the articles.
APPENDIX J

Control Article and Cognitive Response Section
Consensus that surprises even Bud
the team's move to the NL, a thre-quarters of Brewers' fans favor
League Baseball show that more than
that now I'll get to see."

Brewers will win the NL Central in
with that
like to see Ken Griffey Jr. go or Cal
League and the new stadium being
Brewers' jersey he's wearing and his
resemblance to Robin Yount The
say Tim Vanderhoeft, 49, who bears a

Noteeworthy change in the AL this century to change leagues. The last
time it happened was 1891 when the St.
people associate those times with National
romantic era fix h««-ball, and a lot o f
Braves leaving for Atlanta in 1965. In 13
seasons at County Stadium, after moving
from Boston in 1953, the Milwaukee
Braves never had a losing season and in
1957 because the first NL team to draw 2
million fans. With players such as Hank
Aaron, Warren Spahn, Lew Burdett and
Eddie Mathews, the Braves won the 1957
World Series.

"I can see why there's still so many die­
hard National League fans in
Milwaukee," Garner says. "That was a
romantic era for baseball, and a lot of
people associate those times with National
League Baseball. They're glad to see it
back." The Brewers are the first team in
this century to change leagues. The last
time it happened was 1891 when the St.
Louis Cardinals and three other teams that
later folded were absorbed into the NL
from the old American Association.

Class of Baseball
By Frank Birsley
WEEKLY POST

Brewers general manager Sal
Bando is excited about the team
they've built. Added to the club are
outfielder Marquis Grissom and
pitchers Jeff Juden, Mike Myers and
Chad Fox. "In 1992, my first year
here, we had a very good club with a
lot of veteran players - (Paul) Molitor,
(Robin) Yount, (Jim) Gantner and
good, solid pitching," Bando says.
"This is the best team we're going to
have since '92."

Bando especially likes the Brewers'
chance to compete economically. In
the AL Central, they were consistently
outspent by the White Sox and Astros.
"I think we're a little bit more in our
sphere of ability," he says of the NL
Central.

Gamers, who has a career record of
437-469 as the Brewers' winningest
manager, doesn't think the absence of
the designated hitter in the NL will hurt
his team. If there's a main concern for
the Brewers, it's pitching.

"I think we have capable kids, but it's
da lot like we have a Roger Clemens
where you can pencil in he's going to
give you 200 innings," Garner says.
"Beyond that, my biggest concern is
just the adjustment to the league. I
think we'll do OK, but you just don't
know." The unknown is a big part of
the newness that has Brewers fans
excited. "There hasn't been a better
time for baseball in Wisconsin than
right now," Bando says.
On the following lines, please write all the thoughts you can recall going through your mind when you read the articles. Do not be concerned about spelling, punctuation, or grammar. Do not take more than 2 minutes to do this. If you need more space, please use the back of this page.

On the following lines, please write all of the facts you can recall from the articles. Do not be concerned about spelling, punctuation, or grammar. Do not take more than 1 minute to do this.

On the following lines, please write all of the thoughts you recall going through your mind as you answered the series of survey questions (e.g. agree/disagree, thermometer, sentences, etc.) Do not take more than 2 minutes to do this. If you need more space, please use the other side of the page.
APPENDIX K

Item-to-Total Correlations for Cleveland Indians Baseball Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Certain</th>
<th>Direxp</th>
<th>Extrem</th>
<th>Import</th>
<th>Intens</th>
<th>Knowl</th>
<th>Perrel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AcTh1</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTh2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTh3</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTh4</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTh5</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTk1</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTk2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTk3</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTk4</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcTk5</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cer1</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cer2</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cer3</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cer4</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cer5</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cer6</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dxp1</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dxp2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dxp3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext2</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext3</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext4</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp1</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp2</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp3</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp4</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp5</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp6</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int1</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int3</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int4</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int5</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knw1</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knw2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knw3</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knw4</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knw5</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per1</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per2</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per4</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per5</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

Updated Scale Items From Scale Purification Procedure
Importance Dimension: (3 items)

1. How much do you personally care about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)
2. Compared to how you feel other professional sports teams, how important are the Cleveland Indians to you? (thermometer scale)
3. "I care a great deal about the Cleveland Indians." (4-point scale)

Intensity Dimension: (3 items)

1. Compared to how you feel about other sports teams, how strong are your feelings regarding the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale)
2. How intense is your attitude toward the Cleveland Indians? (thermometer scale)
3. Would you say your feelings about the Cleveland Indians are .... (4-point scale)

Extremity Dimension: (4 items)

Items were unchanged.

Direct Experience Dimension: (3 items)

Items were unchanged.

Certainty Dimension: (3 items)

1. "I am convinced about my opinion of the Cleveland Indians." (4-point scale)
2. Some students have told us that they are very certain of their feelings toward the Cleveland Indians. Others say that they are not certain at all. How certain are you of your feelings about the Cleveland Indians? (7-point scale).
3. With what degree of certainty do you hold your opinion about the Cleveland Indians? (thermometer scale)

Knowledge Dimension: (3 items)

1. How much knowledge do you have about the Cleveland Indians? (thermometer scale)
2. If you were to list everything that you know about the Cleveland Indians, how long would the list be? (4-point scale)
3. "Compared to other teams, I consider myself to be an expert about the Cleveland Indians." (4-point scale)
Affective-Cognitive Consistency Dimension: (10 items)

Affective Component Semantic pairs: Cognitive Component Semantic pairs:
1. Devoted - Opposed
2. Awful - Nice
3. Favorable - Unfavorable
4. Pleasant - Unpleasant
5. Excited - Bored
1. Necessary - Unnecessary
2. Unproductive - Productive
3. Useless - Useful
4. Valuable - Worthless
5. Weak - Strong

Latitude Rejection Dimension (1 items: 9 sentences)

Items were unchanged

Behavioral Dimension: (5 items: All on 7-point scales)

1. I watched a lot of Cleveland Indians' games on TV last season.
2. How often do you wear or display Cleveland Indians' team logo items (i.e. T-Shirt, sweater, jacket, hat, stickers, etc.) on your clothing, at your place of work, or where you live?
3. Following the Cleveland Indians is a high priority among my leisure activities.
4. During the baseball season, how closely do you follow the Cleveland Indians using various sport channels on TV, radio, local news, in the newspaper and sport magazines?
5. I would attend more Cleveland Indians' games if I could afford the time and money.

Commitment Dimension: (5 items: All on 7-point scales)

1. Given the choice, I would increase the amount of time I spend following (i.e. watching, reading, attending, etc.) the Cleveland Indians during the baseball season.
2. I would watch a game featuring the Cleveland Indians baseball team regardless of which team they were playing against.
3. I am a committed fan of the Cleveland Indians baseball team.
4. How willing are you to defend the Cleveland Indians publicly, even if it causes controversy?
5. It would be difficult for me to be a fan of the Cleveland Indians baseball team.
APPENDIX M

Reliability and Item-to-Total Correlation Results for Updated Scale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Item to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude Strength</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Importance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.92*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aff-Cog Consistency</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td># of Items</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Item to Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 379
* denotes standardized alpha
APPENDIX N

Path Diagram for Fan Loyalty Model
Fan Loyalty Path Diagram

Loyalty
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