

Southern Business Review

Volume 37 | Issue 2

Article 3

June 2012

Collegiate Sports Fans Perceptions and Expectations of Personal Seat License Programs

Steve Chen

Morehead State University

Kenneth Henderson

Morehead State University

Evan Worrell

Morehead State University

William Salazar

Morehead State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/sbr>



Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chen, Steve; Henderson, Kenneth; Worrell, Evan; and Salazar, William (2012) "Collegiate Sports Fans Perceptions and Expectations of Personal Seat License Programs," *Southern Business Review*. Vol. 37 : Iss. 2 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/sbr/vol37/iss2/3>

This article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Southern Business Review by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Collegiate Sports Fans Perceptions and Expectations of Personal Seat License Programs

Steve Chen, Kenneth Henderson, Evan Worrell, and William Salazar

Collegiate athletic departments are challenged to boost revenues produced by their sport programs. One

Steve Chen, DSM, is associate professor of management and marketing, School of Business Administration, Morehead State University, Morehead, KY 40351.

Kenneth Henderson, PhD, is associate professor of management and marketing, School of Business Administration, Morehead State University, Morehead, KY 40351.

Evan Worrell, BA, is recent graduate of management and marketing, School of Business Administration, Morehead State University, Morehead, KY 40351.

William Salazar, MA, is grant coordinator of the Kentucky AHED program, Morehead State University, Morehead, KY 40351.

innovative revenue-generating method for professional and college sports was created by legendary Stanford Tennis Coach, Dick Gould in 1986 (Dickey, 2000; Stanford University Athletics, 2011). The personal seat license (PSL) is a special, higher priced season ticket that gives the ticket holder the right to own, resell, or transfer the right to their seat (Barbieri, 2000a; Barlow, 2009a; McCarthy, 2009; Barker 2009). This recent phenomenon in professional sports requires the PSL holders to pay an extra fee to secure a guaranteed seat in addition to regular ticket prices (Fort, 2005). Today, the sale of PSL programs is commonly practiced in professional and major college sports. This ticket selling strategy has gained much recognition because it is a lucrative and acceptable method for bringing additional ticket revenue to the organizations. Starting in 2004, several Top-25 collegiate football programs

(including Michigan, Iowa, and Wisconsin) implemented this pricing strategy. Under today's recessive economy, these powerhouse athletic programs need to generate more revenue. PSLs are becoming a common standard practice for all collegiate programs to increase additional ticket revenue; however, fans' feedback and responses from small and mid-size collegiate programs toward this strategy has not been investigated or discussed, nor are there any published studies that address the consequences (turning the fans away and associating the sports franchise with a negative image of being "greedy"). Moreover, no research outlines the unsuccessful implementation of PSL system at small colleges and universities. For this reason, this study's primary goal is to investigate the perceptions and expectations held by sport fans of a mid-sized regional state university regarding PSLs and whether

this practice would affect the fans' willingness to attend sporting events and purchase seat licenses. Moreover, this study may be of interest to sport marketing directors of small-market venues (National Collegiate Athletic Association Division-II affiliated and National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics athletic programs).

Literature Review

Personal Seat License Programs

PSLs entitle season-ticket holders to purchase the right to their own specifically designated seats in an arena or stadium for any public event. Individuals, who choose to attend the event, pay for season tickets with an additional charge to own their seats (Barker, 2009; Turkebilgi, n.d.). Owners usually obtain the right of the seat as long as they buy season tickets (Muret, 1999). The right of the seat license is often transferable (Miller, 2008). According to Barker (2009), some individuals even buy and resell PSLs as a means to generate personal income. The popularity of PSLs is not confined only to the sports industry. Barbieri (2000a & 2000b) notes that the performance arts and entertainment businesses also embrace this ticket selling trend. As early as the 1980s, Semenik (1983) had begun to study the concept of offering exclusive season ticket privilege for art events. Since

late 1990s, PSL has become a widely adopted method in major professional and college sports for boosting ticket sales and a means to secure revenues upfront for future sports seasons or construction projects (Barlow, 2009b; Levmore, 2008).

In the National Football League (NFL), financial benefit of PSLs is clearly demonstrated by the new construction projects of the New York Giants and New York Jets in the Meadowlands. Twenty percent of the \$1.7 billion cost of the stadium construction for these New York teams was covered by PSL sales (Barlow, 2009a). The Tennessee Titans also sold 85 percent of its available PSLs (raising \$70 million) to finance the Adelphia Coliseum (Muret, 1999). The price range of various NFL PSL programs may range from \$600 to \$4,500 (Hill, 2008; McCarthy, 2009; Muret, 1999). In the late 2000s, the price for specially designated seats and luxury boxes in the new Cowboys stadium reached an unprecedented \$150,000 (Hill, 2008).

At the collegiate level, numerous schools in the major conferences sell PSLs. For example, Ohio State (for men's basketball); Xavier, Texas Tech, Tennessee, Oklahoma, UNC-Charlotte, and Kansas (for men's football) offer their fans PSLs (CBS Sports, 2009; Muret, 2010; Ohio State University, 2010; Rovell, 2006; Scher Zagier, 2010; Schwartz, 2008).

Furthermore, some athletic departments have tweaked the concept of PSLs to create an endowment seating program (ESP) in which donors who give a substantial amount to the school secure season ticket privileges. The "donors" of the ESP can pay for the seat up front for up to 30 years and receive a huge tax write-off for their "charitable contribution" (Barlow, 2009b). It is noted that, since 2004, more Top-25 college football programs have started to introduce this type of two-part pricing practice (Fort, 2005).

Potential Drawbacks of PSLs

Despite the popularity and documented benefits of PSLs, these programs often create high levels of uncertainty and apprehension. Noll (2010) suggests two sources of concern. Team marketing managers are concerned about how to handle events that do not sell out; and how to avoid turning-off the potential loss of regular fans due to the increased ticket prices. As a result of these concerns and possible fan backlash, both the Detroit Lions and Oakland Raiders football franchises chose to forego PSL sales for funding their new stadiums (Muret, 1999).

Some loyal fans reject the idea of a PSL system because the fees are often excessively high and purchase prohibitive (often exceeding \$1,000 for professional teams). Fans who feel cheated or taken advantage of may express their displeasure by turning away

from teams. Fans find it hard to justify paying extra fees for what they had routinely received at a low price (Belson, 2009; Hill, 2008). At the university level, PSL and lottery systems can also upset student fans who believe the best available seats are reserved for wealthy ticket holders (Crizer, 2008). Both of these practices further alienate mid- or low-level income fans because PSL programs are perceived as a strategy to entice corporate groups and wealthy individuals. For that reason, a New Jersey legislator proposed a legislative ban of PSLs in all New Jersey Sports Facilities (Solomon, 2008).

The practice of selling PSLs does not guarantee profits (Florio, 2008; Hill, 2008; Solomon, 2008). Although the high cost of construction projects has pushed many professional teams to sell PSLs, this practice consists of both great revenue potential and economic uncertainty. The exorbitant price of a seat license can turn off the most ardent fan and curtail public demand for season or PSLs. In 2010, a week prior to the season opener, both the NY Jets and NY Giants failed to sell out their PSL tickets (Noll, 2010). When sport teams do not sell out their stadiums, their marketers will face the challenge of re-pricing and reselling empty seats. An important factor to consider is that owning a PSL does not mean that the holder has the

right to buy “all tickets” to all events or occupy the “seat” (Solomon, 2008). In some cases, season ticket holders are forced to forfeit their tickets if they do not pay extra fees to secure their seats for specific sporting events (*The Wisconsin State Journal*, 2000).

Possible Factors Affecting the Purchase of PSL

According to the definition of PSLs offered by Barbieri (2000a) and Fort (2005), it is logical to view PSLs as a special form of season ticket. Consequently, the factors affecting fans’ consumption behaviors toward traditional season ticket holders could be similar to the ones toward the PSL program. This assumption has led the researchers to consider one of the two main hypotheses of this study. For example, past studies have identified several key elements that affect the consumption of collegiate sports. The researchers’ findings were based upon psycho-social motivation and social identity theory to conclude the popular influential factors. Factors associated with the psycho-social motivation theory affecting fans’ ticket purchasing behaviors may include

(1) Team performance: this notion is associated with winning and excitement from watching play action (Baade & Tiehen, 1990; DeSchraver & Jenson, 2002; Mahony, Gladden,

& Funk, 2003; Neale & Funk, 2006);

- (2) The current economy and consumers’ financial status (Beccarini & Ferrand, 2006; Pan & Gavert, 1997; Zapalac, Zhang, Pease, 2010);
- (3) Perceived service quality and incentives (Chen, Salazar, & Fitzgerald, 2009; Chen & Mak, 2010; Zhang, Connaughton, & Vaughn, 2004);
- (4) Social interactions and entertainment (Chen et al., 2009; Neale & Funk, 2006);
- (5) Star athletes: fans’ interest toward the players (Dick & Sack, 2003; Neale & Funk, 2006);
- (6) Escape (Gastafson, 2005); and
- (7) Gender differences (Pan & Gabert, 1997; Zapalac, Zhang, & Pease, 2010).

The researchers are interested in investigating why fans are willing to pay more for a ticket to attend a game when, in fact, they can attend a sporting event by spending less. The concept of “team identification” associated with social identification theory may be able to provide a few insights toward that question.

Team identification is an important consumer behavior variable. When an individual

strongly identifies with a team, he/she will support the team by attending more games, purchasing more team-related media and products, and enjoying the total fan-game experience. Past studies suggest a strong correlation between the strength of team-identification and the incidence of group-supportive consumption behaviors, attendance, and purchase of license seat products (Fisher & Wakefield, 1998; Neale & Funk 2006). It is possible that when teams offer PSL programs, fans with high levels of team-identification will take this offer as a chance to express their team identification and loyalty (Green & Bower, 2012). Thus, the level of fans' team identification can be an indicator of their willingness to support the PSL program.

While trying to understand the fans' perceived value toward a ticket price, the PSL must offer some type of added value or benefit so that fans are willing to pay more for that "special seat." Simply, if the fans don't feel the value of the PSL is worth the price associated with it, then they will choose not to buy it (Green & Bower, 2012). In the sports business, loyal fans and repeat customers are considered as the bread and butter to sustaining business profitability. This is well described by Pareto's 80-20 Principle, meaning 80 percent of profits were coming from 20 percent of the consumers (Reh, 2002). Yoo and Bai

(2007) also conclude that a small increase in loyal consumers brings a significant increase in profitability to a business. Therefore, loyalty programs are often introduced to create additional value and encourage customers to consume products more. Based upon this notion, if sports organizations can retain or increase their loyal fans by offering attractive loyalty programs, the organizations should gain additional profits due to increased attendance.

One of the challenges of sports marketing managers is to determine how their athletic programs can reward their long-term fans and general public. It is generally accepted and perceived by the public that both PSL and ESP programs often offer additional perks to their holders (Barlow, 2009b). Florio (2008) suggests teams can use PSLs as an alternative way to reward long-term fan loyalty. For example, in 2009, Cal State University-Pueblo Athletes offered combo PSL-type packages for basketball, football, and other sports with discount and free parking privileges (Cal State University-Pueblo, 2009). Loyalty programs for the Los Angeles Sparks and Milwaukee Bucks consist of a merchandise discount card, birthday messages, a game-day upgrade voucher, fan exclusive access, a meet and greet event, a discount in the fan souvenir shops, pregame talk, and Q&A sessions with players (Scott, 2006; WOAI.com, 2009). In

order to satisfy season ticket holders, the New England Patriots even conduct surveys with a focus group to better understand loyal fans' expectations (Gill, 2001). The implementation of loyalty programs has been proven to create positive experiences by making consumers feel more acknowledged and respected (Dreze & Nunes, 2009). When the offered incentives and benefits are valued by the fans, then they will be willing to spend more money to purchase more expensive PSL packages instead of the traditional season tickets. Marketing managers conclude that owning a PSL program may boost one's social status and self-esteem and, thus, be more supportive to the team, as this expresses a level of wealth. As the saying goes, membership has its privileges.

Summary

In an attempt to examine spectators' expectations and willingness to purchase PSLs, the researchers proposed two specific hypotheses. First, they assume that factors affecting consumers' purchasing behaviors toward a PSL should be similar to those toward the traditional season ticket. This was based upon the definition given in past PSL studies that highlighted a special form of pricy season ticket. Second, the psycho-social motivation constructs and team identification theory are viewed as the key reasons to influence participants' willingness to support or

purchase PSLs. The researchers also expect the practice of implementing PSL may not be over-whelmingly supported by the spectators. Although PSL programs often have added values and incentives attached to entice buyers, given the current economy, the participants may still not feel the added values are worth of the potential increased cost.

Methodology

Participants and Procedure

Two hundred and twenty-seven spectators (males = 53%; females = 47%) including parents and relatives of students, alumni, faculty, and local fans of a regional university completed the survey. Among the aforementioned four participatory groups, local fans, alumni, and students' parents and relatives made up about 80 percent of the total participants. The participants were predominately Caucasian Americans (93%). The two largest age groups were over 50 (31.3%) and under 24 (24.2%). Approximately 62 percent of the participants had annual incomes of more than \$40,000. About a half of the participants (51%) had been a fan of the program for more than seven years. Nearly 26 percent of the participants were traditional season ticket holders. The researchers were convinced that the majority of the participants (at least 50%) of this sample were qualified

to be potential PSL holders due to two criteria: (a) the high numbers of individuals (62%) who had average annual incomes of more than \$40,000, and (b) the many individuals who had been long-term fans or were existing season ticket holders.

The researchers' initial intent was to target 300 respondents. A convenience sampling approach was applied on site. Since the average attendance of a basketball game was about 3,200, the researchers were able to randomly select one hundred participants from each of the three basketball home games played in late January of 2011. Respondents were approached and recruited by the researchers and their assistants to complete the survey during two time slots. Participants would either fill out the survey during half-time or while entering the main entrance of the arena. Participation was strictly voluntary. It took an average of less than 10 minutes to complete a survey. Overall, a fairly high return rate was achieved ($n = 227$; 75.7%).

Instrumentation

The 46-item survey questionnaire sought participant responses to their general perception of PSL programs ($n = 13$); their expectations for owning a PSL ($n = 16$); their willingness to attend athletic events ($n = 2$); their willingness to purchase a PSL ($n = 2$); their level of team identification ($n = 6$);

demographic information ($n = 6$); and an open ended question for additional feedback. Other than the demographic questions, the rest of the items were displayed in a 5-point Likert Scale format with 1 indicating "strongly disagree" and 5 indicating "strongly agree." Participants were asked to rate 39 listed Likert-scale items concerning their willingness to purchase season tickets, their level of team identification, and their perception toward the benefits and drawbacks for owning a PSL. All of the rating items were adopted from past studies (Chen et al, 2009; Fisher & Wakefield, 1998; Gastafson, 2010; Pan & Gabert, 1997; Zhang et al., 2004; Zapalac, et al., 2010). Two college marketing faculty members, the athletic director, and assistant athletic director of a regional university served as content experts and reviewed the questionnaire for face validity. The results of a pilot study validated the reliability of the instrument (Cronbach's Alpha value greater than .700 for each construct). The same procedure for reliability tests was performed again for the full sample as well. Tables 1-3 display the Cronbach's Alpha values.

Results

Factor Analyses

The factor analysis identified five primary

constructs that covered all of the 5-point Likert scale items ($n = 39$). These five constructs were (1) general perception on PSL; (2) expectations for owning a PSL; (3) level of team identification; (4) willingness to attend games; and (5) willingness to support a PSL program. The result of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures and Bartlett's test of sphericity were recorded. The KMO measures of all five constructs were greater than .835, which indicated solid factor models were obtained. Overall, participants' willingness to support the implementation of a PSL program is at the moderate level ($M = 3.56$), along with their willingness in purchasing a PSL ($M = 3.21$). Both of the aforementioned statements reflected a moderate level of support toward the PSL program ($M = 3.37$). Their willingness to attend sport events appears to be slightly higher ($M = 3.83$).

Factor analyses yielded a two-factor construct regarding participants' general perceptions toward the PSL. The first sub-factor was identified as "tangible/intangible benefits" ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .96$). The second sub-factor was "perceptions associated with the PSL" ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.06$). The researchers labeled these constructs based upon the way items loaded on the two constructs. Table 1 lists the description of the construct items.

Three major sub-factors categorized the participants' expectations toward the ownership of the PSL: (1) facility and ticket service ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .90$); (2) value of entertainment and social interaction ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .93$); and (3) food and gifts ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 1.17$) (see Table 2).

The construct of "team identification" included six items. Overall, the participants' average rating level to team identification was 3.58 ($SD = 1.10$). This figure is also slightly greater than the willingness to purchase a PSL. Table 3 illustrates the detailed description of each item in the team identification construct.

Regression Analysis

The results of the stepwise regression analyses are listed in Tables 4 and 5. Two acceptable models were identified for predicting the participants' overall willingness to purchase PSLs. Model Two of Table 4 showed that participants' willingness to purchase the PSL is best predicted by two sub-factors "tangible and intangible benefits" and "team identification," which exhibit two of the highest coefficients (.428 and .345 respectively). Table 5 illustrates two acceptable models for predicting the participants' willingness to attend the game among all other social variable constructs. The result showed the best predictors for the

willingness to attend athletic events were "team identification" (coefficient = .575) and "facility and ticket services" (coefficient = .238).

Analysis of Variances

Significant differences on certain aspects of expectations, perceptions, and team identification were found based upon demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, race, income level, annual spending on licensed merchandise, and years of affiliation with the program, e.g., male participants tended to have a significantly greater rating (2.91 vs. 2.48) on "perceptions associated with the PSL" than their female counterparts ($p < .05$). Participants who were 50 or older had a lower rating than any other age groups in two constructs, "perceptions associated with the PSL" and "Food and gifts" ($p < .01$). Caucasian Americans had a significant lower rating on "facility and ticket services" and "food and gifts" than non-Caucasian American ($p < .05$). Participants with an annual income of \$20,000-39,000 had the lowest rating in "perceptions associated with the PSL" and "food and gifts" ($p < .05$).

Participants with a low spending amount on licensing merchandise also had a low team identification ($p < .01$) and a low willingness to purchase the PSL ($p < .01$). Interestingly, willingness to purchase PSLs was the lowest

Table 1
General Perception on PSL
(Cronbach's Alpha= .838; loading = 57.5%)

Factor and Item	Score	(M & SD)
Tangible/Intangible Benefits for the Holders (9 items) *increasing revenues, receiving discount, creating a sense of importance, demonstrating passion, receiving complimentary items, & building social affiliation	3.69	(0.96)
Perceptions Associated with the PSL (4 items) *receiving preferential treatment, discouraging other attendees, & taking better seats	2.82	(1.06)

Table 2
Participants Expectations for Owning a PSL
(Cronbach's Alpha: .900; Loading = 62%)

Sub Factor	Score	(M & SD)
Facility and ticket service (6 items) *Parking, condition of the facility, reserve tickets, & comfortable seats	4.00	(.90)
Value on entertainment & social interaction (5 items) *Seating with friends, good matches and dances	3.75	(.93)
Food and Gifts (3 items) *Souvenirs offered, free food and drink included, hospitality in President's clubhouse	3.26	(1.17)

Table 3
Participants' Team Identification
(Cronbach's Alpha: .900; Loading = 62%)

Items	Score	(M & SD)
I take criticism toward my team as a personal insult	3.51	(1.29)
I care about what others think of my team	3.79	(1.23)
Team's success is my success	3.42	(1.30)
I feel honored when someone praises my team	3.53	(1.34)
I feel upset when someone criticizes my team	3.73	(1.28)
I use the term "we" instead of "they"	3.71	(1.29)

Table 4
Regression Analysis of the Overall Willingness to purchase PSLs

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	.629	.325		1.935	.055
Tangible and intangible benefits	.743	.085	.542	8.707	.000
2 (Constant)	-.215	.335		-.639	.523
Tangible and intangible benefits	.587	.084	.428	7.019	.000
Team identification	.402	.071	.345	5.648	.000

Table 5
Regression Analysis of the Willingness to Attend Athletic Events

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardize Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	1.335	.216		6.194	.000
Team identification	.714	.058	.671	12.305	.000
2 (Constant)	.422	.301		1.399	.164
Team identification	.612	.061	.575	10.061	.000
Facility and ticket services	.316	.076	.238	4.162	.000

for those who had been a loyal fan for more than 10 years ($p < .01$). In general, those who were willing to purchase a PSL had a significantly higher rating on “team identification” and “willingness to attend the games” ($p < .01$).

Discussions and Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that fans of a mid-sized regional institution do not enthusiastically favor the implementation of a PSL program. Participants

indicated a moderate level of interest in supporting a PSL program ($M = 3.37$). Nearly 31 percent of the participants opposed or were neutral regarding the implementation of a PSL program while less than one half (about 45%) of the participants would pay extra to upgrade their current season tickets to a personal seat license. Interestingly, people who had attended events for seven years or more represented the majority of the votes cast against the PSL program. In other words, people who considered

themselves affiliated with the athletic program for many years and spent little on licensed merchandise clearly exhibited a low level of willingness to purchase PSLs. Their ratings and open-ended comments tended to discourage the idea of implementing the PSL program and support Hypothesis 1 (not fervently supporting the implementation of PSLs program).

It is not surprising to note from the survey results that long term fans chose not to support the PSL program. The researchers have several

possible explanations regarding this phenomenon. It is possible that fans who identify with a sports program do not exhibit a high level of team identification. This type of “fair weather” fan is contented with the existing single-ticket price, as the single ticket price has always been affordable, and this type of fan does not see any reason to invest more money for the “same” product. Another possible explanation is, if fans do not see the benefits of a PSL, most likely they will not be willing to pay the extra cost (Rovell, 2006).

The literature and this research support the finding that the concept of PSLs is relatively new to small- and mid-size collegiate athletic programs, and athletic departments do not know how to develop marketing plans to provide viable and attractive benefits for potential PSL participants and are hesitant to incorporate PSL proposals to supplement their current sports marketing strategy. Nevertheless, sports marketing directors and athletic administrators are encouraged to continue to research the feasibility of incorporating PSLs as a way to offer their loyal fan base an attractive supplement to traditional season ticket licenses. Long time ticket holding fans possess the financial ability to pay premiere ticket prices and comprise the largest and most consistent fan group of the institution.

Based upon the results listed in Table 1, the participants did not have a high rating on some of the perceived items associated with the PSL ($M < 3.00$). This means that they would not act like “rich snobs,” expect differential treatment, or discourage other attendees from “taking” the better seats. This finding may indicate that alienating student fans and discriminating against low-income spectators are a largely exaggerated concern by regional and small athletic programs. Another interesting finding is that the participants’ perception toward the “dibs” and special privileges. They did not perceive getting free souvenirs, food and drink, and access to the clubhouse that may come along with owning a seat license would make them special elites. Furthermore, the surveyed participants stated that they do not expect those preferential treatments either. According to Barlow (2009), the endowment seating programs at other colleges and universities tend to emphasize those “perks” as selling points. It seems those selling points may not be important attractions to this surveyed group.

This study revealed that participants under 24 years old comprised 21 percent of the respondents. Although this group of participants presently may not have the financial wealth to purchase PSLs, they are the most promising

potential future PSL holders. This age group reported a fairly strong willingness to support PSL programs and a desire to purchase PSLs since their willingness ranked the second highest among all of the age groups ($M = 3.63$ and 3.32 , respectively). The university’s best strategy should be trying to capture and cultivate this young group’ awareness and interest towards PSLs. As soon as these young spectators establish their professional careers, they will be the best clients for small- and mid-sized college sports financial futures.

This research project supports previous research findings that spectators with a stronger level of team identification are willing to attend more games (Fisher & Wakefield, 1998; Neale & Funk, 2006). The current season ticket holders (who are older and have more discretionary income) in this study sample confirmed this finding. The participants’ willingness to support and purchase PSLs are best predicted by their rating in “tangible and intangible benefits” and “team identification” as shown by the regression analysis. This means fans who exhibit a greater level of team identification and attribute more value to discount, social affiliation, incentives, and social prestige are more likely to support or own a season ticket license. These two items

are strong indicators that affect fans' traditional season ticket purchasing behavior (Fisher & Wakefield, 1998; Chen et al, 2009; Chen & Mak, 2010; Neale & Funk, 2006). Overall, the findings of this study suggested that the determining factors for a willingness to purchase season ticket licenses and PSL packages are similar. Thus, viewing the PSL as a special program to the traditional season ticket is a logical and worthwhile sports marketing strategy. Moreover, this confirms the second hypothesis of this study.

Based upon the these findings and discussion, the researchers suggest that small- and mid-size collegiate athletic programs and regional university athletic teams should carefully and thoroughly investigate their market size and fan base before attempting to implement a PSL program. Athletic sports venues should consider the needs of their loyal fan base, as it is important to retain the perennial loyal fan base. At this point, an overwhelming support for the PSLs does not exist; however, the responses still lean toward positive behaviors in the future of implementing a PSL program ($M > 3.00$). These researchers agree that the benefits and added values of the PSL program may sway long-term loyal customers of the surveyed institution.

From a practical sports marketing perspective, this

applied research provides a positive direction toward implementing a PSL program at regional universities and similar regional institutions. It is tempting to conclude that the research findings imply that the PSL system practiced by the professional leagues, major athletic programs and other entertainment venues should not be blatantly applied to regional universities and small market sports teams without further examination and consideration. The limitation of surveying participants from one regional university school, however, prevents the researchers from making this recommendation or extending this generalization to regional and small- and mid-sized collegiate athletic and regional university sports marketing directors.

The researchers recommend that future sports management researchers (and sports athletic and university administrators) conduct applied research surveys to other small- and mid-sized collegiate athletic programs to add to the literature-base to allow these athletic programs to make sound sports marketing economic decisions. It is the recommendation of the researchers that the potential to incorporate PSLs in small- and mid-sized collegiate athletic programs is a viable study endeavor as the research indicates that there may be a propensity of and preference for small school and mid-sized collegiate athletic fans toward

participating in a PSL program. Additional research in NCAA Division II, Division III, and NAIA athletic programs will contribute to research that will allow sport directors and administrators to draw from well-researched projects in order to make clear and solid sports marketing generalizations.

References

- Baade, R. A., & Tiehen, L. J. (1990). An analysis of Major League Baseball attendance, 1969-1987. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 14(1), 14-32.
- Barbieri, K. (2000a). Sheds get personal seat licenses. *Amusement Business*, 112(18), 1-2.
- Barbieri, K. (2000b). Industry watches for "unknowns" of PSLs. *Amusement Business*, 112(18), 4.
- Barker, J. (2009) *Owning a Ravens seat can pay off big time*. Retrieved September 4, 2010 from http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2009-06-25/news/0906240127_1_ravens-psls-seat-licenses.
- Barlow, T. (2009a). *Sport biz: Personal seat licenses are a license to print money*. Retrieved August 31, 2010 from <http://www.dailyfinance.com/story/investing/sports-biz-personal-seat-licenses-are-a-license-to-print-money/1547028/>.

- Barlow, T. (2009b). *Beyond the personal seat license: The endowment seating plan*. Retrieved September 5, 2010. <http://www.wallex.com/blog/2009/10/01/beyond-the-personal-seat-license-the-endowment-seating-program/>.
- Beccarini, C., & Ferrand, A. (2006). Factors affecting soccer club season ticket holder's satisfaction: The influence of club image and fans' motives. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(1), 1-22.
- Belson, K. (2009). Judge's ruling keeps alive lawsuit over seat licenses. *New York Times*, 3.
- Cal State University-Pueblo (2009). *2009-2010 season ticket information*. Retrieved June 7, 2012 from <http://www.go-thunderwolves.com/information/tickets>.
- CBS Sports (2009). *Charlotte to begin selling permanent seat licenses*. Retrieved January 30, 2011 from <http://www.cbssports.com/college-football/story/11309749>.
- Chen, S., & Mak, J. (2010). Collegiate basketball season-ticket holders' purchasing motivation and interests. *Journal of Applied Marketing Theory*, 1(2), 1-7.
- Chen, S., Salazar, W., & Fitzgerald, L. (2009). Factors affecting collegiate sports season-ticket holders' satisfaction and renewal intention. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 80(Suppl. 1), A-107.
- Crizer, Z. (2008). *Basketball ticket lottery irks ardent Cassell-ites*. Retrieved June 4, 2011, from <http://www.collegiatetimes.com/stories/12165/basketball-ticket-lottery-irks-ardent-cassell-ites>.
- DeSchraver, T. D. & Jensen, P.E. (2002). Determinants of spectator attendance at NCAA Division II football contests. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16(4), 311-330.
- Dick, R., & Sack, A.L. (2003). NBA marketing director's perceptions of effective marketing techniques: A longitudinal perspective. *International Sports Journal*, 7(1), 88-99.
- Dickey, G. (2000). *Gould serves up new ideas*. Retrieved September 6, 2010 from <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article/article?f=/c/a/2000/04/07/SP35080.DTL>.
- Dreze, X., & Nunes, J. C. (2009). Feeling superior: The impact of loyalty program structure on consumers' perceptions of status. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(6), 890-905.
- Fisher, R. J., & Wakefield, K. (1998). Factors leading to group identification: A field study of winners and losers. *Psychology and Marketing*, 15(1), 23-40.
- Florio, M. (2008). *Expensive seats squeezing out NFL fans?* Retrieved September 2, 2010 from <http://nbcsports.msnbc.com/id/25417558/>.
- Fort, R. D. (2005). *Sports economics* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Gill, J. (2007). *Patriots not in focus with season ticket holders*. Retrieved March 11, 2011 from <http://boston.sportsthenandnow.com/2010/07/07/patriots-not-in-focus-with-season-ticket-holders/>.
- Green B. C., & Bowers, M. T. (2012). Understanding sport consumer behavior. In B.L. Parkhouse, B. A. Turner, & K. S. Miloch (Eds.) (2012). *Marketing for sport business success* (p. 55-79). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing.
- Gustafson, M. W. (2005). *The relative importance of*

- sportscape in football game attendance at a NCAA Division-I university.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University. Retrieved September 15, 2010 from http://etd.lib.ttu.edu/theses/available/etd-11292005-105311/unrestricted/Gustafson_mike_diss.pdf.
- Hill, J. (2008). *Personal seat licenses, rising ticket prices spell doom.* Retrieved September 3, 2010 from <http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/page2/story?page=hill/080801&sportCat=nfl>.
- Levmore, S. (2008). *Personal seat licenses.* Retrieved September 4, 2010 from <http://uchicagolaw.typepad.com/faculty/2008/08/personal-seat-l.html>.
- Mahony, D. F., Gladden, J. M., & Funk, D. C. (2003). Examining athletic donors at NCAA Division I institutions. *International Sports Journal*, 7(1), 9-27.
- McCarthy, M. (2009). *Cowboys and Yankees join IMG in college sports marketing venture.* Retrieved September 6, 2010 from <http://www.neweratickets.com/company/month-in-review/Cowboys-and-Yankees-Join-IMG-in-College-Sports-Marketing-Venture/>.
- Miller, M. (2008). *The newest investment vehicle: "Personal Seat Licenses"?* Retrieved September 4, 2010 from http://lawprofessors.typepad.com/contractsprof_blog/2008/06/the-newest-inve.html.
- Muret, D. (2010). Texas Tech tosses PSLs, rolls out new options for hoops fans. *Street and Smith's SportsBusiness Journal*, 12(14), 12.
- Muret, D. (1999). NFL's Detroit Lions choose to forego sales of PSLs for new domed stadium. *Amusement Business*, 111(49), 10.
- National Basketball Association (2010). *2010-11 MVP loyalty rewards program.* Retrieved June 3, 2011 from http://www.nba.com/bucks/tickets/sth10_loyalty.html.
- Neale, L., & Funk, D. (2006). Investigating motivation, attitudinal loyalty and attendance behavior with fans of Australian football. *International Journal of Sport Marketing and Sponsorship*, 7(4), 267-285.
- Noll, R. G. (2010). *A few thoughts about Measure J.* Retrieved September 4, 2010, from http://articles.sfgate.com/2010-05-16/opinion/20900743_1_stadium-authority-seat-licenses-ticket-tax.
- Ohio State University (2010). *OSU men's basketball PSL.* Retrieved March 11, 2011 from http://www.ohiostatebuckeyes.com/ViewArticle.dbml?&DB_OEM_ID=17300&ATCLID=1603714.
- Pan, D. W., & Gabert, T. E. (1997). Factors and differential demographic effects on purchases of season tickets for intercollegiate football. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 20(4), 447-465.
- Reh, F. J. (2002). *Pareto's principle: The 80-20 rule.* Retrieved March 26, 2012 from <http://management.about.com/cs/generalmanagement/a/Pareto081202.htm>.
- Rovell, D. (2006). *The high price of supply and demand.* Retrieved January 13, 2011 from <http://sports.espn.go.com/ncf/news/story?id=2286027>.
- Scher Zagier, A. S. (2010). *Colleges offering 'sports mortgages': Programs hope top-seat pricing scores revenue.* Retrieved April 11, 2011, from http://articles.boston.com/2010-03-31/business/29328136_1_top-seats.

- season-football-tickets-fans.
- Schwartz, P. J. (2008). *The most valuable college basketball teams*. Retrieved January 16, 2011 from http://www.forbes.com/2007/12/27/college-basketball-valuations-biz-sports_cz_js_0102basketball.html.
- Scott, A. (2006). *LA Spark's fans flock to loyalty program*. Retrieved July 1, 2013 from <http://promomagazine.com/incen-tives/lasparksfans/>.
- Semenik, R. J. (1983). Season ticket proneness among art attenders, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 6(2), 45-55.
- Solomon, G. (2008). *Personal Seat Licenses: Jets, Giants color new stadium green*. Retrieved September 4, 2010, from <http://ctsportslaw.com/2008/08/19/personal-seat-licenses-jets-giants-color-new-stadium-green/>.
- Stanford University Athletics. (2010). *Dick Gould profile*. Retrieved September 5, 2010 from http://www.gostanford.com/sports/m-tennis/mtt/gould_dick00.html.
- The Wisconsin State Journal*. (2000). Packers season-ticket holders forfeit tickets, if fees are unpaid they have to cough up \$600 to \$1400 per seat by mid-march. Retrieved September 5, 2010 from <http://english.turkcebilgi.com/Personal+Seat+License>.
- Turkcebilgi. (n.d.). *Personal seat licenses*. Retrieved September 5, 2010 from <http://english.turkcebilgi.com/Personal+Seat+License>.
- WOAI. (2009). *Spurs to reward season ticket holders with "exclusive" access*. Retrieved March 21, 2011 from <http://www.woai.com/content/sports/spurs/story/Spurs-to-reward-season-ticket-holders-with/VHU-r2-atU2Dca5 FXuZDgw.csp>.
- Yoo, M., & Bai, B. (2007). Value creation: The impact of strategic alliance on customer loyalty. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 8(2), 45-65.
- Zapalac, R. K., Zhang, J. J., & Pease, D. G. (2010). Understanding women's collegiate volleyball spectators from the perspectives of socio-demographics, market demand and consumption level. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 11(4), 320-343.
- Zhang, J. J., Connaughton, D., & Vaughn, C. E. (2004). The role of special programmes and services for season ticket holders in predicting game consumption. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 6 (2), 99-116.

Acknowledgement: The researchers would like to thank the students of Morehead State University, Sports Marketing 482 and Marketing 600 classes for their support in data collection.

Copyright of Southern Business Review is the property of Georgia Southern University, College of Business Administration and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.