



Motives to engage with sports brands on Facebook and Instagram - the case of a Portuguese football club

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship</i>
Manuscript ID	IJSMS-06-2019-0066.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Social Media, Facebook, Instagram, Motivations, Consumer Engagement, Sports Branding

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Motives to engage with sports brands on Facebook and Instagram - the case of a Portuguese football club

Abstract

Purpose: Social network sites are key marketing tools that allow brands to connect and engage with consumers. However, there is still a lack of evidence of their value for football brands. This research aims to understand the motivations for fans to engage with their favourite football brands on Facebook and Instagram.

Design/methodology/approach: An online survey was performed, resulting in 214 valid responses. As the social media strategy followed by the football brand analysed was built around games, we divided fans into two groups based on the main method in which the club's games are watched: in stadium versus mediated. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to explore the relationship between motivations and fans' engagement, through content consumption and contribution, on Facebook and Instagram. Analysis was performed first with the whole sample and then by group (stadium attendance vs. mediated attendance fans).

Findings: The findings show that social influence, entertainment, searching for information, and rewards are the most relevant motivations for consumers to engage with brand-related content on Facebook. Entertainment, rewards, and social influence are the main motivations influencing consumer interactions on Instagram. Group moderation was only confirmed in the impact of social influence on Facebook page content consumption.

Originality/value: The results provide valuable insights into the social media marketing activities of sports brands, which will assist brand managers to develop strategies for effectively stimulating engagement with the different groups of fans.

Keywords: social media; Facebook; Instagram; motivations; consumer engagement; football fans; sports branding.

Paper Type: Research paper

Introduction

Social media has changed the communication landscape and online consumer behaviour, with social networking sites (SNSs) becoming key players in branding activities (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). SNSs have become the best channel for brands to reach customers

1
2
3 globally, build stronger relationships with customers, and influence relevant behavioural
4 outcomes (Kaz and Karahan, 2011; Gummerus *et al.*, 2012; Yoshida *et al.*, 2018).

5
6 Football (soccer), as a sports and entertainment activity, has particularities that few
7 sectors can count on, and it generates a degree of commitment (including emotional
8 commitment) among fans that is unheard of in other categories (Chadwick and Beech,
9 2007; Sutton *et al.*, 1997). Fans tend to be lifelong supporters of the brand and display
10 high levels of loyalty, meaning that is highly unlikely for them to change brands (Tapp,
11 2004). Having fans in mind, social media provides unique opportunities for football
12 brands to maintain and enhance relationships with potential fans (Pegoraro, 2010;
13 Pronschinske *et al.*, 2012); to enhance the frequency and intensity of fan interactions,
14 despite the absence of a shared geography (Parganas *et al.*, 2017); and to generate relevant
15 sources of income (Kriemadis *et al.*, 2010).

16
17 Even though their brand affiliation and loyalty may stay the same throughout their
18 lifetimes, fans have a constant need to consume brand-related content – for example
19 content related to their favourite athlete, their favourite coach, or the transfer market, so
20 content related to the weekly match is no longer enough (Wang and Zhou, 2015). Indeed,
21 football supporters are no longer satisfied with just the promise of a good match at the
22 weekends (García, 2011); they are seeking constant engagement and affiliation (Williams
23 and Chinn, 2010; Wallace *et al.*, 2011). Hence, social media can play a critical role in
24 meeting these new needs. Moreover, as pointed out by Abosag *et al.* (2012), the more
25 satisfied and fulfilled the needs of the sports consumer are, the more likely he/she is to
26 consume products associated with the brand.

27
28 However, it is worth noting that football fans can have the same preference for one
29 club but may have different needs and expectations towards it. Football supporters may
30 differ in their consumption of brand-related products, levels of commitment and loyalty,
31 match day activities, behaviour towards results, and motivations for sports consumption
32 (Trail *et al.*, 2003; Tapp and Clowes, 2002; Tapp, 2004; Dionisio *et al.*, 2008). Therefore,
33 it is necessary for football brands to pay attention, on a daily basis, to what their fans are
34 looking for so that they can satisfy their customer bases as much as possible and benefit
35 from this.

36
37 The aim of this research is to understand what drives consumers to engage with
38 football brands on SNSs. Specifically, this study focuses on consumer engagement with
39 a major Portuguese sports brand, Futebol Clube do Porto (FCP), which is one of the most
40

1
2
3 important football brands in Portugal and a respected brand in the Fédération
4 Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) and the Union of European Football
5 Associations (UEFA) championships.
6
7

8 This study explores the factors driving consumers'/fans' engagement with the FCP
9 brand on SNSs, focusing on the activity of FCP on Facebook and Instagram, as these are
10 the most relevant SNSs in Portugal and worldwide (Marktest, 2018; Statista, 2019a,
11 2019b). In particular, the aims of this study are (1) to identify the major motivations for
12 FCP fans to engage with the brand on Facebook and Instagram; and (2) to test whether
13 these motivations differ across different types of FCP supporters (stadium attendance vs.
14 mediated attendance fans).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Literature Review**

23 *Social Media and Sports Brands*

24
25
26 Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) define social media as a group of Internet-based applications
27 that are built on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0 and that allow
28 the creation and exchange of user-generated content (UGC). Social media incorporates a
29 wide range of online tools, including “blogs, company-sponsored discussion boards and
30 chat rooms, consumer-to-consumer e-mail, consumer product or service ratings websites
31 and forums, internet discussion boards and forums, moblogs (sites containing digital
32 audio, images, movies, or photographs), and social networking websites” (Mangold and
33 Faulds, 2009, p. 358). Social media's capability for communicating and sharing
34 information has radically transformed consumer behaviour and the way that consumers
35 relate to brands; hence, companies must pay particular attention to social media (Kaplan
36 and Haenlein, 2010; Vale and Fernandes, 2018). According to Hennig-Thurau *et al.*
37 (2010), consumers are no longer just passive recipients of information, as the flow of
38 information through this new generation of media is multidirectional, interconnected, and
39 difficult to predict. As a result, Meng *et al.* (2015) point out that managers should view
40 social media as a more contemporary form of word-of-mouth communication within the
41 conventional marketing mix. Word of mouth (WOM) occurs whenever a user likes,
42 comments on, or shares brand-related content (Kietzmann *et al.*, 2011; Swani *et al.*,
43 2013). Therefore, it is crucial for sports organizations to identify the types of social media
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 content that appeal to users' common interests and stimulate likes, comments, and shares
4 (Kietzmann *et al.*, 2011).
5

6 The social media landscape is transforming consumer–brand interactions, in particular
7 how brand-related content is created, distributed, and consumed (Tsai and Men, 2013).
8 Due to their particularly low cost and high effectiveness, social media platforms, such as
9 Facebook and Instagram, are being increasingly used by companies (Kaz and Karahan
10 2011) and by sports organizations and athletes (Billings *et al.*, 2017; Osokin, 2019). They
11 allow sports brands to engage with consumers/fans in a timely and direct way at a
12 relatively low cost with high levels of efficiency (Pegoraro and Jinnah, 2012; Kaplan and
13 Haenlein, 2010; Thompson *et al.*, 2014) and to expand their marketing influence and
14 reach (Hanna *et al.*, 2011), providing a unique environment for sports brands to extend
15 their experiences and identities (Gantz, 2013). Sports brands can use social media for
16 informational/promotional purposes, such as to provide online catalogues for their
17 merchandising and stimulate sales; for ticket booking; for information regarding ticket
18 availability for matches and special online promotions; and to promote additional
19 products and services, such as corporate hospitality or travel services (Hedlund, 2014;
20 Kriemadis *et al.*, 2010). Moreover, social media platforms offer sports brands the
21 possibility to connect with their consumers/fans at a level far beyond the reach of
22 traditional offline marketing (Pronschinske *et al.*, 2012; Thompson *et al.*, 2014) and to
23 effectively transmit the brand identity and desired brand associations to their supporters
24 (Naylor *et al.*, 2012; Parganas *et al.*, 2017). By deepening their connections with
25 consumers through social media, brands can reach a wider audience and Karahan
26 encourage continuous interactions with their consumers and among consumers (Kaz and
27 2011), which stimulate cross-selling opportunities to distinct groups sharing the same
28 platform (Hodge *et al.*, 2010).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Sports brands' official fan pages on Facebook and Instagram can be considered special
47 types of online brand communities (Habibi *et al.*, 2014), which can be critical tools for
48 sports brands to connect to their fans (Grant *et al.*, 2011) and to build a strong sense of
49 social identity among fans (Underwood *et al.*, 2001). Hence, brand communities on
50 Facebook or Instagram should be central in the marketing strategies of sports brands
51 (Grant *et al.*, 2011; Lupinek, 2019). Brand community members (or brand fans) tend to
52 become less sensitive to bad performances and more loyal to the sports brand (Grant *et*
53 *al.*, 2011); they can be critical brand advocates (Habibi *et al.*, 2014), as well as evangelists
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Shau *et al.*, 2009); and they can be an important source of innovation, as the future of the brand matters to them (Füller *et al.*, 2008). Therefore, it is essential for sports brands to discover new ways to stimulate fans' engagement with their official fan pages on Facebook and Instagram.

Sports Brands' Engagement on Social Media

As a sector, sports exhibit a number of unique characteristics (Abosag *et al.*, 2012; Chadwick and Beech, 2007; Cherubini, 2006; Mason, 1999; Mullin *et al.*, 2000; Sutton *et al.*, 1997; Westerbeek and Smith, 2003): the product is highly inconsistent and the marketer has very little control over it; the consumer is involved in creating the service, becoming a "prosumer"; sports brands have multiple stakeholders that they must satisfy; sports are consumed publicly but are also a highly personal experience, linked with identity and self-image; and sports generate very high levels of consumer commitment and emotional involvement. For sports brands, consumer loyalty is extremely important, as sports fans are very unlikely to change their commitment, and lifelong brand loyalty is the norm (Tapp, 2004; Abosag *et al.*, 2012). Due to the level of commitment of sports fans and supporters, sports brands are in a privileged position to build strong and enduring relationships with individuals (Abosag *et al.*, 2012).

However, to maintain committed and loyal fans, the guarantee of good matches is no longer enough (García, 2011); sports brands need to develop continuous and sustainable relationships that are less dependent on sports success, where fans are permanently engaged (Pronschinske *et al.*, 2012). According to previous studies (e.g. Ioakimidis, 2010; Hur *et al.*, 2011; Wallace *et al.*, 2011; Wang and Zhou, 2015; Williams and Chinn, 2010), online platforms, particularly social media, can play a crucial role in strengthening the relationships between sports brands and their consumers/fans. In order to stimulate positive consumer behaviours, it is critical that sports brands effectively stimulate consumer-brand engagement on social media (Hedlund, 2014; Yoshida *et al.*, 2014).

Despite the increasing attention paid to consumer-brand engagement in the last decade, there seems to be a lack of consensus on what consumer engagement is. Some authors emphasize the psychological process that occurs due to the interactive, co-creative experiences with a focal agent/object (i.e. a brand) in a service relationship (Brodie *et al.*, 2011; Hollebeek, 2011; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014), while others focus on the behavioural aspects of this relationship (e.g. van Doorn *et al.*, 2010). Authors adopting a

1
2
3 more comprehensive perspective have conceptualized engagement as a construct with
4 cognitive, affective, and behavioural dimensions (e.g. Brodie *et al.*, 2011, 2013;
5 Hollebeek, 2011; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014; Leckie *et al.*, 2016). In this study, we are
6 particularly interested in the behavioural approach to consumer–brand engagement and
7 follow van Doorn *et al.*'s (2010, p. 254) conceptualization that consumer–brand
8 engagement involves “customers’ behavioural manifestations that have a brand or a firm
9 focus, beyond purchase, resulting from motivational drivers”. This approach has appeared
10 in several studies (e.g. Gummerus *et al.*, 2012; Machado *et al.*, 2019; Schamari and
11 Schaeffers, 2015; van Doorn *et al.*, 2010), particularly those on consumer–brand
12 engagement in social media. Hence, consumer–brand interactions and consumer-to-
13 consumer communications about the brand are considered critical indicators of
14 consumer–brand engagement on Facebook and Instagram (Gummerus *et al.*, 2012; van
15 Doorn *et al.*, 2010).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Muntinga *et al.* (2011) present a typology of consumers’ online brand-related activities (COBRAs) that reflect consumer engagement with brands on SNSs according to three continuous levels: consumption, contribution, and creation of brand-related content – the ultimate level of consumer–brand engagement. In this research we adopt the simplified classification of Tsai and Men (2013) who propose only two levels of consumer–brand engagement in SNS brand pages: consuming and contributing. Consuming brand-related content involves watching videos, viewing pictures, or reading brand-related comments. Contributing to brand-related content represents user interactions with the brand or with other users about the brand and may involve liking, commenting on, or sharing brand-related content (Muntinga *et al.*, 2011; Tsai and Men, 2013; Azar *et al.*, 2016).

Conceptual Model

Motivations to Engage with Sports Brands on Social Media

According to the literature on consumer–brand interaction on SNSs (Azar *et al.*, 2016; Enginkaya and Yilmaz, 2014; Jahn and Kunz, 2012; Li *et al.*, 2019; Martins and Patrício, 2018; Osokin, 2019; Stavros *et al.*, 2014; Rohm *et al.*, 2013), consumer engagement in online brand communities (Gummerus *et al.*, 2012; Shu and Chuang, 2011), and COBRAs (Daugherty *et al.*, 2008; Muntinga *et al.*, 2011), five main motivations

1
2
3 associated with the use of SNSs can be highlighted, namely: social influence, searching
4 for information, rewards, conversation, and entertainment.

5
6 The motive *social influence* regards to the chance of the brand followers to reinforce their
7 identity and gain social recognition from peers based on their participation on the brand
8 page. *Search for information* relates to the possibility of accessing to useful information,
9 created by both the brand brand page followers, about the brand's products and services.
10
11 *Reward* is related with the opportunity given to brand page followers to gain benefits such
12 as promotions and discounts or prizes in games and sweepstakes organized by the host
13 brand. *Conversation*, in this case, means the openness offered to brand page followers to
14 directly interact with the brand in a free and easy way. Finally, *entertainment* is the
15 emotional release and relaxation followers can get by engaging with the brand page
16 content.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Some studies have already studied motivations to engage with sports brands on SNS.
25 Witkemper *et al.* (2012) examined the motives that influence Twitter users to consume
26 content related to athletes and found that motivations linked with search for information,
27 entertainment and fanship were relevant. More recently, Li *et al.* (2019) explored whether
28 consumer motivations to interact with sports organizations differed on Twitter and Weibo
29 and found that motivations related to searching for information and entertainment were
30 more important for Weibo users, while Twitter followers were motivated to express their
31 support for the team, which can be linked with social influence. Moreover, Stavros *et al.*
32 (2019) found that active participation, *i.e.* commenting, on Facebook pages of NBA teams
33 is mainly motivated by "camaradie" (i.e. desire for identification and interaction within
34 the community, including knowledge seeking and protecting the group from negative
35 influences), a motive related with social influence.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The purpose of the present study is to identify which motivations explain engagement
46 (through both consumption and contribution) with sports brands on Facebook and
47 Instagram and, especially, to identify possible differences between the two platforms. In
48 the absence of a specific framework to evaluate the motivations for sports consumers to
49 engage with sports brands on Facebook and Instagram, we use the ones that are most
50 often used in the social media literature (e.g. Azar *et al.*, 2016; Curran & Lennon, 2011;
51 Gummerus *et al.*, 2012; Jahn & Kunz, 2012; Li *et al.*, 2018; Rohm *et al.*, 2013; Shu &
52 Chuang, 2011; Stavros *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, we state the following hypotheses:
53
54
55
56
57

58 Therefore, we state the following hypotheses:
59
60

1
2
3 1) The need for (H1.1) social influence/ (H1.2) information/ (H1.3) entertainment/
4 (H1.4) conversation/ (H1.5) reward positively influence fan consumption of content on
5 football brand pages on Facebook/ Instagram.
6
7

8 2) The need for (H2.1) social influence/ (H2.2) information/ (H2.3) entertainment/
9 (H2.4) conversation/ (H2.5) reward positively influence fan contribution to football brand
10 pages on Facebook/ Instagram.
11
12
13

14 15 *Spectatorship as a Moderator – Stadium vs. Mediated Attendance*

16
17 In general, fans of sports teams have much higher levels of involvement with the sport
18 and the club than customers have with other mainstream products (Stuart and Smith,
19 1999, Smit and Stuart, 2010; Tapp and Clowes, 2002). That is why these individuals, who
20 are deeply committed with a club, are seldom referred a customers or consumers and are
21 generally called *fans* (whose origin is the word fanatics), *supporters* or *partisans*. The
22 commitment of these unique customers is manifested by long term exclusive affiliation
23 with that club, by significant time and money expenditure, and unconditional loyalty,
24 even when the club is not performing well (Silva and Las Casas, 2017). However, fans
25 consume sport- and team-related products/services differently. In the field of sports, game
26 attendance is probably the most important consumption behaviour. While some
27 supporters watch games occasionally, others cannot miss a game of their club (Samra and
28 Wos, 2014). Whereas many fans usually follow their club's games through TV or the
29 internet, some others are frequent stadium goers (Buraimo and Simmons, 2009). Previous
30 studies show that different game consumption patterns, namely the degree of stadium
31 attendance, are closely related to the strength of fans' connection to the club. For example,
32 Tapp and Clowes (2002; 2004) analysed football supporters according to behavioural
33 variables such as level of game attendance at the stadium and the amount of money spent
34 on tickets and merchandise. They found that heavy stadium attendants tended to be also
35 more involved with the sport and the team. Other studies found significant positive
36 relationships between stadium attendance and sociopsychological variables such as
37 identification with the team (Wann and Branscombe, 1993; Rocha and Fleury, 2017;
38 Silveira *et al.*, 2019), team attachment (Kim and Trail, 2010), and team involvement and
39 loyalty (Silveira *et al.*, 2019).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 Obviously, not all enthusiastic fans are frequent stadium goers. The generalized
58 broadcast of football games, either on free-to-air terrestrial television or by cable or
59
60

1
2
3 satellite with subscription (Buraimo and Simmons, 2009), along with the growth of illegal
4 live-streaming (Birmingham and David, 2011) and the multiple potential attendance
5 constraints (Rocha and Fleury, 2017; Silveira *et al.*, 2019), such as high ticket prices and
6 geographical distance, may hinder stadium attendance by many passionate supporters.
7
8 Nevertheless, the experience of attending a game at the stadium is undoubtedly distinct
9 from any mediated attendance experience. The social interaction with other spectators
10 and with the team playing, that is enabled by in-stadium spectatorship, generates a sense
11 of community that cannot be derived from any other form of attendance (Lee *et al.*, 2012).
12
13 Therefore, it seems relevant to differentiate fans according to their spectatorship type:
14 fans who systematically support their club in the stadium (many are fee-paying members
15 and buy season ticket), and those who, despite their psychological connection to the team,
16 choose indirect means to watch the games. As they experience the game in different
17 manners, their needs as fans and spectators are also different. Therefore, it is expected
18 that the use of other game- and club-related services, such as the official fan pages in
19 social media is distinct among them.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Taking this into consideration, this research's purpose is not only to understand the
30 overall motivations of fans to engage with sports brands but also to identify the
31 differences in motivations according to their spectatorship type: in stadium or mediated.
32
33

34 Therefore, we hypothesize that fan *spectatorship* is a moderator of the relationships
35 between the five motivations (*social influence, searching for information, rewards,*
36 *conversation, and entertainment*) and consumer engagement (*content consumption and*
37 *contribution*) on social media sports brand pages (on Facebook and Instagram).
38
39

40
41 Therefore, we state that:

42
43 3) Fan spectatorship type moderates the relationship between (H3.1) social influence/
44 (H3.2) information/ (H3.3) entertainment/ (H3.4) conversation/ (H3.5) reward and
45 consumption of content on football brand pages on Facebook/ Instagram.
46
47

48 4) Fan spectatorship type moderates the relationship between (H4.1) social influence/
49 (H4.2) information/ (H4.3) entertainment/ (H4.4) conversation/ (H4.5) reward positively
50 influence contribution to football brand pages on Facebook/ Instagram.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Research Design

The focus of the investigation is the brand FCP (Futebol Clube do Porto), which is a well-known Portuguese multisport club. However, for the purpose of this research, we will study only the football branch. Founded in 1893, FCP is a Portuguese football club based in the city of Porto, in the north of Portugal. It is one of the most successful Portuguese clubs, being greatly respected internationally – it is the ninth best club in Europe, according to the UEFA ranking (UEFA, 2019). FCP fans are famous for their passion and deep bonds with the FCP brand. FCP is the most followed Portuguese club on social media and 43rd globally (Digital Sports Media, 2018), which makes it a good case study.

Data collection

To collect data, a self-administrated online survey was developed using Google Forms and targeted at FCP supporters using social media. The survey comprised four main sections. The first section related to respondents' social media and sports consumption. Respondents were asked about the average time spent on Facebook and Instagram, FCP membership status, main way of following matches, and motives for consuming FCP football games. The motives for sports consumption were measured using the Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption (Trail and James, 2001), which comprises eight multi-item subscales: *fans' vicarious achievement*, *fans' acquisition of knowledge*, *aesthetics*, *drama*, *escape*, *physical attractiveness of the athletes*, *physical skills of the participants*, and *social interaction* (Appendix 1). Each item was measured using a seven-point Likert scale, with the endpoints being "1 – strongly disagree" and "7 – strongly agree". In the second section, respondents were asked about their level of engagement with the FCP pages on both Facebook and Instagram. The two dimensions of consumer–brand engagement (consuming and contributing) were assessed using multi-item measures (Tsai and Men, 2013) on a seven-point Likert scale, with the endpoints being "1 – never" and "7 – always". The third group of questions addressed the respondents' motivations for engaging with FCP on Facebook and Instagram. The five constructs (social influence, searching for information, rewards, conversation, and entertainment) were also assessed using multi-item measures (Azar *et al.*, 2016; Enginkaya and Yilmaz, 2014; Jahn and Kunz) on a seven-point Likert scale, with the endpoints being "1 – strongly disagree" and "7 – strongly disagree". The last group of questions was devoted to collecting

sociodemographic data. The multi-item scales and their sources can be found in Appendix 1.

Although most of the items were originally written in English, the majority of the scales used in this study have been adapted to Portuguese in previous research on brand page engagement on Facebook (Azar et al., 2016). In these scales, only small adaptations were needed to accommodate the inclusion of Instagram in this study. Only part of the items had to be translated into Portuguese by the authors (who are native Portuguese speakers), namely those of the *conversation* motivation scale (Enginkaya & Yilmaz, 2014) and those of the Motivation Scale for Sports Consumptions (Trail and James, 2001). In these cases, the resulting Portuguese version was again translated into English, without any information about the study's purpose, by a native English speaker who was fluent in Portuguese. Drawing upon the results of this English–Portuguese translation, some misunderstood items were identified and rewritten in order to eliminate discrepancies.

Data Analysis

In order to analyse the data collected through the survey, several statistical procedures were performed using IBM SPSS. To ensure their psychometric adequacy, multi-item scales, adopted to measure the constructs included in the conceptual model, were first subject to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS SPSS. Cronbach alpha, average variance extracted (AVE) and construct reliability were then computed. When construct validity was confirmed, composite measures of each construct were obtained by averaging the results of all the items of each of the multi-item scale (Hair et al., 2014). These composite measures were used to run four multiple linear regression models with ordinary least squares method of estimation, in SPSS. Each model has a different response variable: (1) content consumption on Facebook; (2) contribution on Facebook (3) content consumption on Instagram (4) and contribution on Instagram.

Subsequently, the moderation of fan *spectatorship* – a dummy variable, where 0 = mediated attendance group and 1 = stadium attendance group – was considered in all four mentioned models. Following Frazier *et al.* (2004) recommendations, before running the regression models, all the predictor variables (those regarding motives), were standardized to reduce problems associated with multicollinearity among the variables in the regression equation. After that, five interaction terms were created (regarding both

Instagram and Facebook data): *social influence* \times *group*; *searching for information* (standardized) \times *group*; *entertainment* (standardized) \times *group*; *conversation* (standardized) \times *group*; and *reward* (standardized) \times *group*. Next, hierarchical linear regression analysis was performed in all four models, *i.e.*, predictor variables were entered into the regression models through a series of specified blocks. The first block includes only the standardized predictor variables. In the second block, the moderator variable is added as a predictor. Finally, in the third block, product terms are also added to the model. Moderation effects are tested through an *F* test, that represents the stepwise change in variance explained as a result of the addition of the product terms to the model. Once we determined that a significant moderator effect exists, we have inspected its form, by comparing β values (slopes of the regression equation) among the two groups – stadium attendance vs mediated attendance fans.

Results

Sample Characterization

The sample comprised 214 respondents who followed FCP on social media (responses from FCP fans who did not follow the club on Facebook or Instagram were eliminated from the analysis). From these, 42 (19.6%) were female and 172 (80.4%) were male. Most of the respondents (61.2%) were FCP club members. Regarding the FCP pages on SNSs, 201 respondents followed the club on Facebook, and 161 respondents followed it on Instagram. The majority of this sample's fans watch FCP games predominantly at the stadium (48.6%), whereas 43.0% watch them mainly on television. More details on the sample may be observed in Table 1, where sample characterization is also presented by group – stadium attendance fans vs mediated attendance fans.

--- Insert Table 1 ---

Psychometric properties assessment

To ensure the psychometric adequacy of the multi-item scales adopted to measure the conceptual model constructs, CFA, using AMOS SPSS, was conducted (Hair *et al.*, 2014) in both Facebook and Instagram data. Model fits of both measurement models are acceptable (table 2), despite some slight deviation from the recommended RMSEA values

(e.g. Hair *et al.*, 2014) in the Instagram case, which may be related with a smaller sample size (Kenny *et al.*, 2015).

---Insert Table 2---

Construct validity was assessed through the analysis of convergent and discriminant validity (Hair *et al.*, 2014), whose results can be found in tables 2 and 3. All the standardized factor loadings are above .70. Simultaneously, average variance extracted (AVE) is higher than the minimum recommended of .50 as well as construct reliability and Cronbach alpha, which are above the threshold 0.7 in all scales of the measurement model. These findings indicate that the indicators of each construct share a high proportion of variance in common (table 2), which means convergent validity is present. To assess discriminant validity, we compared the AVE values for any two constructs with the square of the correlation estimate between these two constructs. We have systematically found AVE values higher the squared correlations, evidencing the uniqueness of each construct of the model (Table 3).

--- Insert Table 3 ---

The observation of descriptive statistics in Table 3 (means and standard deviations) also offers some insight about FCP fans engagement patterns. FCP fans are much stronger consumers than contributors and on the side of motivations, reward is clearly the least important for the fans. These findings apply to both Facebook and Instagram pages.

Model Test with the Whole Sample

After verifying the psychometric adequacy of the adopted measures, total scores were computed for each construct by averaging the scores of their corresponding items. Regression analysis was carried out with these composite measures. The results of the multiple linear regression show that only the social influence ($\beta=.199$; $p<0.05$) and entertainment ($\beta=.587$; $p<0.01$) motivations had a significant impact on the consumption

of content on the FCP Facebook page. When Instagram was considered, only entertainment ($\beta=.543$; $p<0.01$) could partly explain the content consumption (Table 4).

---Insert Table 4---

According to the results, contribution on Facebook was explained by the motivations of social influence ($\beta=.458$; $p<0.01$), searching for information ($\beta=.217$; $p<0.05$), and rewards ($\beta=.165$; $p<0.05$). A similar pattern was found for contribution on Instagram, except for searching for information, which, in this case, was not a significant predictor of the dependent variable. The motivations of social influence ($\beta=.212$; $p<0.05$) and rewards ($\beta=.406$; $p<0.01$) were both predictors of contribution on Instagram (Table 5).

---Insert Table 5---

Model Test with Moderation

To check whether motivations to engage with the social media pages of sports clubs vary across different kinds of supporters, we considered two different groups: the stadium attendance fans (FCP supporters who predominantly watch the games in the stadium) and the mediated attendance fans (those who follow the games through other indirect means). Two respondents (out of 214) stated that they did not regularly follow the matches, so they were eliminated from this analysis. As a validity check, to ensure that the two groups correspond to different profiles of sports' consumption, we compared the results of both groups on the subscales that constitute the Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption (Trail and James, 2001), whose items can be found in Appendix 1. The results of independent samples t-tests (Table 6) confirmed the existence of statistically significant differences between the two groups on all the subscales, except "drama". The stadium attendance group scored significantly higher than the mediated attendance group on all the remaining subscales, evidencing that those individuals had a higher sense of self-esteem associated with the club's achievements; a higher need for acquiring knowledge about the club; a higher appreciation of the game's aesthetics and the players' physical skills; a superior perception of escape associated with watching the game; and a stronger sense of enjoyment related to socializing with other fans of the same club.

1
2
3 --- Insert Table 6 ---
4
5

6 The results of this analysis are presented in Table 7.
7
8

9
10 ---Insert Table 7---
11
12

13 Regarding the impact of motivations on the consumption of content on Facebook, the
14 analysis confirmed the existence of a group moderation effect ($F(5; 188)=3.077; p<0.05$).
15 However, moderation was only applicable to the effect of social influence ($\beta_{social\ influence}$
16 $_{*group}=-7.46; p<.01$). When the model regarding the consumption of content on Facebook
17 was run for the different groups of fans, separately, (Table 8), entertainment was found
18 to be a significant predictor for both the stadium ($\beta=.405; p<.01$) and the mediated
19 attendance ($\beta=.666; p<.01$) groups of fans. On the other hand, social influence only
20 predicted content consumption for the mediated attendance group of fans ($\beta=.460;$
21 $p<.01$), explaining the meaning of the moderation effect.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 ---Insert Table 8---
31
32
33

34 Regarding contribution to the Facebook page, the interaction analysis indicated the
35 inexistence of a group moderation effect ($F(5;188)=0.825; p>0.05$). In line with this
36 result, when linear regression was run separately for the groups, no differences emerged
37 (Table 9). Only social influence emerged as a good predictor of the contribution of
38 content for both the stadium attendance group ($\beta=.406; p<.01$) and the mediated
39 attendance group of fans ($\beta=.546; p<.01$). It is worth noting that because of the sample
40 sizes and the consequent loss of test power, the effects of searching for information and
41 rewards, which were significant when the whole group was considered, were not
42 identified in the multi-group analysis.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 ---Insert Table 9 ---
52
53
54

55 The results indicate no group moderation effect concerning both consumption
56 ($F(5;147)=0.413; p>0.05$) and contribution on Instagram ($F(5;147)=0.567; p>0.05$). In
57 line with the findings for the whole sample, entertainment arose as the only significant
58
59
60

1
2
3 predictor for both stadium attendance fans ($\beta=.622$; $p<.01$) and mediated attendance fans
4 ($\beta=.500$; $p<.01$), as shown in Table 10.
5
6
7

8
9 ---Insert Table 10---

10
11
12 Running the predictive model of contribution on Instagram (Table 11) for the groups
13 separately showed that rewards were a significant predictor for both groups: the stadium
14 attendance fans ($\beta=.335$; $p<.01$) and the mediated attendance fans ($\beta=.457$; $p<.01$).
15
16
17

18
19 ---Insert Table 11---

20 21 22 23 **Discussion and Conclusion**

24
25 Social media platforms, SNSs in particular, are critical marketing tools for sports
26 marketers and managers to create and increase consumer/fan involvement with the brand.
27 Through SNSs, brands can communicate directly with their consumers/fans; obtain and
28 respond to their feedback, without time restrictions and space boundaries (Kaplan and
29 Haenlein, 2010); enhance their offerings; provide a better service (Kabadayi and Price,
30 2014); strengthen consumer/fan–brand relationships (Ioakimidis, 2010; Parganas *et al.*,
31 2017; Santos *et al.*, 2019) and the relationships among consumers/fans (Uhrich, 2014);
32 and influence fundamental behavioural intentions (Biscaia *et al.*, 2018; Bruner and
33 Kumar, 2000; Huettermann *et al.*, 2019). The present study investigated the motivational
34 factors that drive consumer/fan engagement with sports brand on SNSs, being the first to
35 compare Facebook and Instagram and also to consider the motivations of different groups
36 of fans, according to the way they live the game experience. In the next two sections, we
37 discuss the theoretical contributions and managerial implications of our study.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Theoretical Contributions*

50
51 This research contributes to the literature in a variety of ways. First, this research
52 complements previous literature on consumer–brand engagement on social media (e.g.
53 Azar *et al.*, 2016; Mathwick, 2002; Muntinga *et al.*, 2011; Parganas *et al.*, 2017; Stavros
54 *et al.*, 2014) by examining the different types of consumer/fan interactions with sports
55 brands on Facebook and Instagram. The first finding highlights that FCP fans are much
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more consumers of content than contributors on both Facebook and Instagram pages. The
4 lack of active participation may hinder a higher level of fan engagement and identification
5 with the sports brand. According to prior literature, the consumption of brand-related
6 content is a participatory and valuable form of social media behaviour (Edelman, 2013;
7 Machado *et al.*, 2019; Shang *et al.*, 2006; Wang and Stefanone, 2013), and “lurkers” are
8 a relevant target for sports brands’ communication on SNSs. However, too many lurkers
9 will lead to low posting rates and a lack of valuable content (Sun *et al.*, 2014). Thus, it is
10 essential for sports brands to understand what drives fan engagement in order to stimulate
11 lurkers to become more-active contributors to the brands’ Facebook and Instagram pages.
12 This research makes a relevant contribution in this respect by extending the understanding
13 of fans’ motives for engaging with sports brands through the consumption and
14 contribution of brand-related content on Facebook and Instagram.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The findings show that the consumption of content on FCP’s Facebook and Instagram
25 pages seems to be mainly related to entertainment. Fans consume content mostly because
26 they find it fun and entertaining. In contrast to other studies carried out in other contexts
27 (e.g. Jahn and Kunz, 2012; Li *et al.*, 2019; Martins and Patrício, 2018), the perception of
28 the brand page as a source of useful information did not emerge as a predictor of content
29 consumption. This may be related to the fact that the core offering of a sports brand is
30 entertainment, as sports are services with a high hedonic value (Hightower *et al.*, 2002).
31 Therefore, it is expected that attitudes and behaviours towards sports draw mainly upon
32 experiential rather than functional attributes (such as the ability to be informative). An
33 additional explanation may be related to the fact that this study was conducted in Portugal:
34 a country where TV channels and newspapers, offline and online, assign plenty of time
35 and space to football-related information, possibly pushing social media brand pages to a
36 secondary position concerning factual information dissemination.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Social influence was also found to be an antecedent of content consumption but
47 exclusively on Facebook. This is possibly related to the idiosyncrasies of each platform.
48 While Facebook is mostly a hybrid platform that combines images and text in a similar
49 proportion, Instagram is focused on visual content, rather than textual information. This
50 enhances companies’ visual storytelling (Neher, 2013; Stelzner, 2016; Virtanen *et al.*,
51 2017) but possibly reduces perceived social presence – the capacity to create in users an
52 awareness of other people (Cui *et al.*, 2013).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Another interesting finding is that social influence is an antecedent of content consumption on the FCP Facebook page only for those fans who do not regularly attend games at the stadium. A possible reason for this result is the fact that those who generally go to the stadium fulfil the need for social belonging to the club by means of the collective experience of watching the games in the stadium. As watching a game on TV (or any other indirect medium) is much less social than the stadium experience, the use of social media (Facebook in this case) may be a way of increasing the sociability of that experience before, during, and after a match, even if not by actively participating but rather by observing what the club and other fans are posting,

Two motivations emerged as antecedents of contribution to FCP's Facebook and Instagram pages: social influence and rewards. Hence, in line with prior studies (e.g. Azar *et al.*, 2016; Osokin, 2019; Santos *et al.*, 2019; Stavros *et al.*, 2014), the results suggest that active engagement is mainly related to the need for belonging to the community by interacting with the brand and other fans and to participation in contests and other activities that allow fans to get something in return (e.g. free tickets, special offers, and discounts). Searching for information was found to be a predictor of contribution but only for the Facebook page, which might be explained by the aforementioned reason: the hybrid nature of Facebook (images and text) is more suitable for conveying factual information.

Managerial Implications

This research also provides relevant managerial implications, as it presents valuable insights for sports brand managers intending to nurture the relationships with fans through Facebook and Instagram. In this respect, the findings highlight that sports brand managers can significantly benefit from the use of entertaining, socially influencing, and rewarding posts when designing their SNS strategies. Indeed, the results indicate that these motivations are the main drivers of engagement on both platforms. Searching for information is only a predictor of engagement on Facebook, and conversations with the brand took no role in triggering consumer engagement, regardless of the platform.

Thus, to effectively drive brand engagement, sports brands should deliver hedonic content that allows fans to escape from their daily routines, relax, and feel amusement and enjoyment (e.g. funny and humorous posts linked with the sports team / athletes or with supporters; behind-the-scenes videos and pictures of the team and players; videos

1
2
3 highlighting unique moments in the team's performance; exclusive pictures of the
4 highlights of the game; and special videos for anniversaries of the sports brand's most
5 important milestones). Furthermore, as social influence is a fundamental driver of fans'
6 contribution of brand-related content on Facebook and Instagram, brand managers should
7 use their brands' Facebook and Instagram pages to engage socially active fans by
8 highlighting the self-expressive nature of the sports brand. Hence, brand managers should
9 post emotional content that stimulates fans to express themselves through the association
10 with the sports brand (e.g. content about the pride of being a fan or about the importance
11 of interacting with other fans and fostering group identification). Moreover, they should
12 provide fans with incentives for spreading the brand messages among their social
13 networks (e.g. contests that reward fans who obtain the greatest number of likes among
14 their friends and hence act as the best brand ambassadors). The creation of specially
15 designed community games and events could also stimulate interactions among fans and
16 between fans and the sports brand. Finally, in order to stimulate reward-oriented fans,
17 sports brands need to actively post timely and relevant content with objective brand
18 benefits that provides fans with utilitarian incentives (e.g. monetary rewards, deals, or
19 incentives) or extrinsic material incentives (e.g. the possibility to take part in raffles and
20 competitions) for commenting on and sharing brand posts. Hence, sports brands should
21 post announcements about special contests and promotions (e.g. offer fans the possibility
22 to participate in contests to win official brand merchandise or a free visit to the club's
23 stadium or museum). SNS contests and games have the additional advantage of triggering
24 interactions among fans and between fans and the brand, thereby encouraging social
25 interaction.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 Facebook is the platform where social interaction seems to be predominantly
44 happening, probably because of its technical features, which are more discourse oriented
45 than those of Instagram, which is more image focused. Thus, this should be the chosen
46 platform to launch and nurture discussion. Moreover, as Facebook is the channel where
47 fans are more likely to go when they are searching for information, it should be the elected
48 platform to convey information about the core product or other brand-related products.
49 On the other hand, Instagram requires a different approach: one that is more informal and
50 entertainment oriented. Fostering active engagement on both platforms requires constant
51 posts about contests and other activities that call for consumer/fan actions in exchange
52 for free tickets, promotions, and other benefits.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Another interesting contribution of this study is the fact that there are slight differences in the pattern of engagement motives between fans who regularly attend games at the stadium and those who generally follow the games through indirect means, like TV. The consumption of content on Facebook is predicted by social motives only for the latter, suggesting that this SNS may work as a mechanism to offset the absence of other fans belonging to the club's community when the game is not attended in the stadium. This suggests that sports brands should strive to create exclusive, timely content about the game (before, during, and after) and foster discussion around it in order to create an experience of higher involvement, nurturing the sense of community.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study was limited by the nature and size of the sample. Data was collected exclusively from the supporters of one club and one sport (football) and at one specific limited point in time of the season, which limited the potential generalization of the findings. The size of the sample also hindered the use of more-complex and -powerful statistical tools, such as structural equation modelling. Moreover, the limited sample size is also responsible for some unsatisfactory fit indices' values of the CFA model. Therefore, future researches should take this issue into account and use the largest sample size possible. Furthermore, in future studies, it will be important to increase the diversity of respondents, namely by including low-involvement supporters who follow their clubs or other sports clubs on social media. A significant majority of this study's participants were highly passionate about and engaged with the club, which might explain why very few differences were identified based on the type of supporter. Previous studies have suggested that fan engagement with a sports brand and other fans on SNSs can lead to the building of significant relationships (Ioakimidis, 2010; Bruner and Kumar, 2000; Santos *et al.*, 2019); therefore, it would be a relevant endeavour to understand if fans who actively engage with a sports brand on Facebook and/or Instagram feel a stronger identification with the brand and consequently demonstrate critical behavioural intentions towards the brand (Biscaia *et al.*, 2018).

References

- Abosag, I., Roper, S. and Hind, D. (2012), "Examining the relationship between brand emotion and brand extension among supporters of professional football clubs", *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(9), pp. 1233-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090561211247810>
- Azar, S.L., Machado, J.C., Vacas-de-Carvalho, L. and Mendes, A. (2016), "Motivations to interact with brands on Facebook – Towards a typology of consumer–brand interactions", *Journal of Brand Management*, 23(2), pp. 153-78. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2016.3>
- Billings, A.C., Qiao, F., Conlin, L. and Nie, T. (2017), "Permanently desiring the temporary? Snapchat social media and the shifting motivations of sports fans", *Online Information Review*, 37(5), pp. 10-26.
- Birmingham, J., and David, M. (2011), "Live-streaming: Will football fans continue to be more law abiding than music fans?", *Sport in Society*, 14(1), pp. 69-80.
- Biscaia, R., Hedlund, D.P., Dickson, G. and Naylor, M. (2018), "Conceptualising and measuring fan identity using stakeholder theory", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 18(4), pp. 459-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2017.1413580>
- Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L., Biljana, J. and Ilic, A. (2011), "Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions and implications for research", *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), pp. 252-71.
- Brodie, R.J., Ilic, A., Biljana, J. and Hollebeek, L. (2013), "Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: an exploratory analysis", *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), pp. 105-14.
- Bruner, G.C. and Kumar, A. (2000), "Web commercials and advertising hierarchy-of-effects", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 40 (1/2), pp. 35-42.
- Buraimo, B., and Simmons, R. (2009), "A tale of two audiences: Spectators, television viewers and outcome uncertainty in Spanish football", *Journal of Economics and Business*, 61(4), pp. 326-338.
- Chadwick, S. and Beech, J. (2007), "Introduction: the marketing of sport", in Beech, J. and Chadwick, S. (Eds.), *The Marketing of Sport*, Pearson Education, Harlow, pp. 3-22.
- Cherubini, S. (2006), "Co-marketing: a new challenge for football managers", in Desbordes, M. (Ed.), *Marketing and Football: An International Perspective*,

- 1
2
3 Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, pp. 108-29.
- 4
5 Cui, G., Lockee, B. and Meng, C. (2013), "Building modern online social presence: a
6 review of social presence theory and its instructional design implications for future
7 trends", *Education and Information Technologies*, 18(4), pp. 661-85.
- 8
9
10 Curran, J. and Lennon, R. (2011) "Participating in the conversation: exploring usage of
11 social media networking sites", *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 15(1), pp.
12 21-39.
- 13
14
15 Daugherty, T., Eastin, M. and Bright, L. (2008), "Exploring consumer motivations for
16 creating user-generated content", *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8(2), pp. 16-25.
- 17
18 Digital Sports Media (2018), "Global digital football benchmark – summer 2018",
19 available at: [http://digitale-sport-medien.com/global-digital-football-benchmark-](http://digitale-sport-medien.com/global-digital-football-benchmark-summer-2018/)
20 [summer-2018/](http://digitale-sport-medien.com/global-digital-football-benchmark-summer-2018/) (accessed 3 June 2019).
- 21
22
23
24 Dionisio, P., Leal, C. and Moutinho, L. (2008), "Fandom affiliation and tribal behaviour:
25 a sports marketing application", *Qualitative Market Research: An International*
26 *Journal*, 11(January), pp. 17-39.
- 27
28
29 Edelman, N. (2013), "Reviewing the definitions of 'lurkers' and some implications for
30 online research", *Cyberpsychology, Behaviour, and Social Networking*, 16(9), pp.
31 645-9.
- 32
33
34 Enginkaya, E. and Yilmaz, H. (2014), "What drives consumers to interact with brands
35 through social media? A motivation scale development study", *Procedia – Social*
36 *and Behavioural Sciences*, 148, pp. 219-26.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.037>
- 38
39
40
41 Field, A. (2009), *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*, London, Sage Publications.
- 42
43 Frazier, P. A., Tix, A. P., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Testing moderator and mediator effects
44 in counseling psychology research. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 51(1), 115.
- 45
46 Füller, J., Matzler, K. and Hoppe, M. (2008), "Brand community members as a source of
47 innovation", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 25(6), pp. 608-19.
- 48
49 Gantz, W. (2013), "Reflections on communication and sport: on fanship and social
50 relationships", *Communication and Sport*, 1(1/2), pp. 176-87.
- 51
52
53 García, C. (2011), "Real Madrid Football Club: applying a relationship-management
54 model to a sport organization in Spain", *International Journal of Sport*
55 *Communication*, 4, pp. 284-99.
- 56
57
58 Grant, N., Heere, B. and Dickson, G. (2011), "New sport teams and the development of
59
60

- brand community", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(1), pp. 35-54.
- Gummerus, J., Lilijander, V., Weman, E. and Philström, M. (2012) "Customer engagement in a Facebook brand community", *Management Research Review*, 35(9), pp. 857-77.
- Habibi, M.R., Laroche, M. and Richard, M.-O. (2014), "Brand communities based in social media: how unique are they? Evidence from two exemplary brand communities", *International Journal of Information Management*, 34(2), pp. 123-32.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B. and Anderson, R. (2014), *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th ed., Edinburgh, Pearson Education
- Hair, J.F., Wolfinbarger, M.F., Ortinau, D.J., and Bush, R.P. (2010), *Essentials of Marketing Research* (3rd ed.), New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Hanna, R., Rohm, A. and Crittenden, V.L. (2011), "We're all connected: the power of the social media ecosystem", *Business Horizons*, 54(3), pp. 265-73.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.007>
- Hedlund, D.P. (2014), "Creating value through membership and participation in sport fan consumption communities", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14(1), pp. 50-71.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Malhouse, E.C., Friege, C., Gensler, S., Lobschat, L., Rangaswamy, A., Skiera, B. (2010), "The impact of new media on customer relationships", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 15(9), pp. 181-96.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510375460>
- Hightower Jr., R., Brady, M.K. and Baker, T.L. (2002), "Investigating the role of the physical environment in hedonic service consumption: an exploratory study of sporting events", *Journal of Business Research*, 55(9), pp. 697-707.
- Hodge, N. (2010). Care and share. *Financial Management*, 20, (4), 21 – 23.
- Hollebeek, L.D. (2011), "Exploring customer brand engagement: definition and themes", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 19(7), pp. 555-73.
- Hollebeek, L.D., Glynn, M.S. and Brodie, R.J. (2014), "Consumer brand engagement in social media: conceptualization, scale development and validation", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28(2), pp. 149-65.
- Huettermann, M., Uhrich, S. and Koenigstorfer, J. (2019), "Components and outcomes of fan engagement in team sports: the perspective of managers and fans", *Journal of*

- 1
2
3 *Global Sport Management*, (March), pp. 1-32. DOI:
4 [10.1080/24704067.2019.1576143](https://doi.org/10.1080/24704067.2019.1576143)
5
6 Hur, Y., Ko, Y.J. and Valacich, J. (2011), "A structural model of the relationships
7 between sport website quality, e-satisfaction, and e-loyalty", *Journal of Sport*
8 *Management*, 25(5), pp. 458-73.
9
10 Ioakimidis, M. (2010), "Online marketing of professional sports clubs: engaging fans on
11 a new playing field", *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*,
12 11(4), pp. 271-82.
13
14 Jahn, B. and Kunz, W. (2012), "How to transform consumers into fans of your brand",
15 *Journal of Service Management*, 23(3), pp. 344-61.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564231211248444>
17
18 Kabadayi, S. and Price, K. (2014), "Consumer–brand engagement on Facebook: liking
19 and commenting behaviours", *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*,
20 8(March), pp. 203-23.
21
22 Kaplan, A.M. and Haenlein, M. (2010), "Users of the world, unite! The challenges and
23 opportunities of social media", *Business Horizons*, 53(1), pp. 59-69.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003>
25
26 Kaz, A. and Karahan, F. (2011), "To be or not to be in social media arena as the most
27 cost-efficient marketing strategy after the global recession", *Procedia – Social and*
28 *Behavioural Sciences*, 24, pp. 260-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.083>
29
30 Kenny, D. A., Kaniskan, B., & McCoach, D. B. (2015). The performance of RMSEA in
31 models with small degrees of freedom. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 44(3),
32 486-507.
33
34 Kietzmann, J.H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I.P. and Silvestre, B.S. (2011), "Social
35 media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media",
36 *Business Horizons*, 54(3), pp. 241-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.005>
37
38 Kim, Y. K., & Trail, G. (2010), "Constraints and motivators: A new model to explain
39 sport consumer behavior", *Journal of Sport Management*, 24(2), 190-210.
40
41 Kriemadis, T., Terzoudis, C. and Kartakoullis, N. (2010), "Internet marketing in football
42 clubs: a comparison between English and Greek websites", *Soccer and Society*,
43 11(3), pp. 291-307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14660971003619677>
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Leckie, C., Nyadzayo, M.W. and Johnson, L.W. (2016), "Antecedents of consumer
4 brand engagement and brand loyalty", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32(5-6),
5 pp. 558-78.
6
7
8 Lee, S., Lee, H. J., Seo, W. J., & Green, C. (2012), "A new approach to stadium
9 experience: The dynamics of the sensoryscape, social interaction, and sense of
10 home", *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(6), pp. 490-505.
11
12
13 Li, B., Dittmore, S.W., Scott, O.K.M. & Lo, W.-J. (2019), "Why we follow: examining
14 motivational differences in following sports organizations on Twitter and Weibo",
15 *Sport Management Review*, 22(3), pp. 335-47.
16
17
18 Lupinek, J. (2019), "Tracing the ABC's of brand community", *International Journal of*
19 *Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 20(2), pp. 291-306.
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-09-2017-0103>
22
23
24 Machado, J.C., Vacas-de-Carvalho, L., Azar, S.L., André, A.R. and Santos, B.P. (2019),
25 "Brand gender and consumer-based brand equity on Facebook: the mediating role of
26 consumer-brand engagement and brand love", *Journal of Business Research*, 96, pp.
27 376-85. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.07.016>
28
29
30
31 Mangold, W.G. and Faulds, D.J. (2009), "Social media: the new hybrid element of the
32 promotion mix", *Business Horizons*, 52(1), pp. 357-65.
33
34 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.03.002>
35
36
37 Marktest (2018), *Os Portugueses e as Redes Sociais*, Lisboa, Marktest Consulting.
38
39 Martins, C. and Patrício, L. (2018), "Company social networks: customer communities
40 or supplementary services?", *Journal of Services Marketing*, 32(4), pp. 443-61.
41
42 Mason, D. (1999), "What is the sports product and who buys it? The marketing of
43 professional sports leagues", *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(3/4), pp. 402-18.
44
45 Mathwick, C. (2002), "Understanding the online consumer: a typology of online
46 relational norms and behaviour", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 16(1), pp. 40-55.
47
48 Meng, M.D., Stavros, C. and Westberg, K. (2015), "Engaging fans through social media:
49 implications for team identification", *Sports, Business and Management: An*
50 *Internal Journal*, 5(3), pp. 199-217.
51
52
53 Mullin, B., Hardy, S. and Sutton, W.A. (2000), *Sport Marketing*, 2nd ed., Human
54 Kinetics, Champaign, IL.
55
56
57 Muntinga, D.G., Moorman, M. and Smit, E.G. (2011), "Introducing COBRAs: exploring
58 motivations for brand-related social media use", *International Journal of*
59
60

- 1
2
3 *Advertising*, 30(1), pp. 13-46. <https://doi.org/10.2501/IJA-30-1-013-046>
- 4
5 Naylor, R., Lamberton, C. and West, P. (2012), "Beyond the 'like' button: the impact of
6 mere virtual presence on brand evaluations and purchase intentions in social media
7 settings", *Journal of Marketing*, 76(November), pp. 105-20.
- 8
9 Neher, K. (2013), *Visual Social Media Marketing: Harnessing Images, Instagram,*
10 *Infographics and Pinterest to Grow Your Business Online*, Boot Camp Publishing,
11 Cincinnati, OH.
- 12
13
14
15 Osokin, N. (2019), "User engagement and gratifications of NSO supporters on Facebook:
16 evidence from European football", *International Journal of Sports Marketing and*
17 *Sponsorship*, 20(1), pp. 61-80.
- 18
19
20
21 Parganas, P., Anagnostopoulos, C. and Chadwick, S. (2017), "Effects of social media
22 interactions on brand associations", *International Journal of Sports Marketing and*
23 *Sponsorship*, 18(2), pp. 149-65.
- 24
25
26 Pegoraro, A. (2010), "Look who's talking – athletes on Twitter: a case study",
27 *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 3(4), pp. 501-14.
- 28
29 Pegoraro, A. and Jinnah, N. (2012), "Tweet'em and reap'em: the impact of professional
30 athletes' use of Twitter on current and potential sponsorship opportunities", *Journal*
31 *of Brand Strategy*, 1(1), pp. 85-97.
- 32
33
34 Pronschinske, M., Groza, M.D. and Walker, M. (2012), "Attracting Facebook fans: the
35 importance of authenticity and engagement as a social networking strategy for
36 professional sport teams", *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 21(4), pp. 221-31.
- 37
38
39 Rocha, C. M., & Fleury, F. A. (2017), "Attendance of Brazilian soccer games: The role
40 of constraints and team identification", *European Sport Management*
41 *Quarterly*, 17(4), pp. 485-505.
- 42
43
44 Rohm, A., Kaltcheva, V. and Milne, G. (2013) "A mixed-method approach to examining
45 brand-consumer interactions driven by social media", *Journal of Research in*
46 *Interactive Marketing*, 7(4), pp. 295-311.
- 47
48
49 Samra, B., & Wos, A. (2014), "Consumer in sports: Fan typology analysis", *Journal of*
50 *Intercultural Management*, 6(4-1), pp. 263-288.
- 51
52
53 Santos, T.O., Correia, A., Biscaia, R. and Pegarro, A. (2019), "Examining fan
54 engagement through social networking sites", *International Journal of Sports*
55 *Marketing and Sponsorship*, 20(1), pp. 163-83.
- 56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Schamari, J. and Schaeffers, T. (2015), "Leaving the home turf: how brands can use
4 webcare on consumer-generated platforms to increase positive consumer
5 engagement", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 30, pp. 20-33.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2014.12.001>
8
9
10 Schau, H. J., Müniz, A. M., and Arnould, E. J. (2009), "How brand community
11 practices create value", *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (September), 30–51.
12
13 Shang, R.A., Chen, Y.-C. and Liao, H.-J. (2006), "The value of participation in virtual
14 consumer communities on brand loyalty", *Internet Research*, 16(4), pp. 479-92.
15
16 Shu, W. and Chuang, Y. (2011), "The perceived benefits of six-degree-separation social
17 networks", *Internet Research*, 21(1), pp. 26-45.
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1108/10662241111104866>
20
21
22 Silva, E. C., & Las Casas, A. L. (2017). Sport fans as consumers: An approach to sport
23 marketing. *British Journal of Marketing Studies*, 5(4), 36-48.
24
25 Silveira, M. P., Cardoso, M. V., and Quevedo-Silva, F. (2019), "Factors influencing
26 attendance at stadiums and arenas", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 37(1), 50-
27 65.
28
29
30 Smith, A.C.T. and Stuart, B. (2010), "The special features of sport: A critical revisit",
31 *Sport Management Review*, 13(1), pp. 1-13
32
33 Stavros, C., Meng, M.D., Westberg, K. and Farrelly, F. (2014), "Understanding fan
34 motivation for interacting on social media", *Sport Management Review*, 17(4), pp.
35 455-69.
36
37
38
39 Sutton, W.A., McDonald, M.A., Milne, G.R. and Cimperman, J. (1997), "Creating and
40 fostering fan identification in sports", *Sports Marketing Quarterly*, 6(1), pp. 15-22.
41
42 Statista (2019a), "Number of monthly active Instagram users from January 2013 to June
43 2018 (in millions)", available at:
44 [https://www.statista.com/statistics/253577/number-of-monthly-active-instagram-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/253577/number-of-monthly-active-instagram-users/)
45 [users/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/253577/number-of-monthly-active-instagram-users/) (accessed 3 June 2019).
46
47
48 Statista (2019b), "Number of monthly active Facebook users worldwide as of 1st quarter
49 2019 (in millions)", available at:
50 [https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/)
51 [users-worldwide/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/) (accessed 3 June 2019).
52
53
54
55 Stelzner, M.A. (2016), "How marketers are using social media to grow their businesses".
56
57 Stewart, B. and Smith, A. (1999), "The Special Features of Sport", *Annals of Leisure*
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 *Research*, 2(1), pp. 87-99, DOI: 10.1080/11745398.1999.10600874
4
5 Sun, N., Rau, P.P.-L. and Ma, L. (2014), "Understanding lurkers in online communities:
6 A literature review", *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 38, pp. 110-17
7
8 Swani, K., Milne, G. and Brown, B.P. (2013), "Spreading the world through likes on
9 Facebook", *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 7(4), pp. 269-94.
10
11 Tapp, A. (2004), "The loyalty of football fans – we'll support you evermore?", *Journal*
12 *of Database Marketing and Customer Strategy Management*, 11(March), pp. 203-
13 15.
14
15 Tapp, A. and Clowes, J. (2002), "From 'carefree casuals' to 'professional wanderers'",
16 *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(11/12), pp. 1248-69.
17
18 Thompson, A., Martin, A.J. and Eagleman, A.N. (2014), "Examining the development of
19 a social media strategy for a national sport organisation", *Journal of Applied Sport*
20 *Management*, 6(2), pp. 42-64.
21
22 Trail, G.T. and James, J.D. (2001), "The Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption:
23 assessment of the scale's psychometric properties", *Journal of Sport Behaviour*,
24 24(1), pp. 108-27.
25
26 Trail, G.T., Fink, J.S. and Anderson, D.F. (2003), "Sport spectator consumption
27 behaviour", *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 12(1), pp. 8-17.
28
29 Tsai, W.S. and Men, L.R. (2013), "Motivations and antecedents of consumer engagement
30 with brand pages on social networking sites", *Journal of Interactive Advertising*,
31 13(February), pp. 76-87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2013.826549>
32
33 Underwood, R., Bond, E. and Baer, R. (2001), "Building service brands via social
34 identity: lessons from the sports marketplace", *Journal of Marketing Theory and*
35 *Practice*, 9(1), pp. 1-13.
36
37 UEFA (2019), "UEFA ranking for club competitions", available at:
38 <https://pt.uefa.com/memberassociations/uefarankings/club/seasonclub/> (accessed 3
39 June 2019).
40
41 Urich, S. (2014), "Exploring customer-to-customer value co-creation platforms and
42 practices in team sports", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14(1), pp. 25-49.
43
44 Vale, L. and Fernandes, T. (2018), "Social media and sports: driving fan engagement with
45 football clubs on Facebook", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 26(1), pp. 37-55.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 van Doorn, J., Lemon, K.N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Doreen, P., Pirner, P. and Verhoef,
4 P.C. (2010), "Customer engagement behaviour: theoretical foundations and research
5 directions", *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), pp. 252-66.
6
7
8 Virtanen, H., Björk, P. and Sjöström, E. (2017), "Follow for follow: marketing of a start-
9 up company on Instagram", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*,
10 24(3), pp. 468-84.
11
12
13 Wallace, L., Wilson, J. and Miloch, K. (2011), "Sporting Facebook: a content analysis of
14 NCAA organizational sport pages and Big 12 Conference athletic department
15 pages", *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 4(4), pp. 422-44.
16
17
18 Wang, S.S. and Stefanone, M.A. (2013), "Showing off? Human mobility and the interplay
19 of traits, self-disclosure and Facebook check-ins", *Social Science Computer Review*,
20 36(1), pp. 437-57.
21
22
23 Wang, Y. and Zhou, S. (2015), "How do sports organizations use social media to build
24 relationships? A content analysis of NBA clubs' Twitter use", *International Journal*
25 *of Sport Communication*, 8(2), pp. 133-48.
26
27
28 Wann, D. L., and Branscombe, N. R. (1993), "Sports fans: Measuring degree of
29 identification with their team", *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 24(1), 1-
30 17.
31
32
33 Westerbeek, H. and Smith, A. (2003), *Sport Business in the Global Marketplace*,
34 Palgrave, New York, NY.
35
36
37 Williams, J. and Chinn, S.J. (2010), "Meeting relationship-marketing goals through social
38 media: a conceptual model for sport marketers", *International Journal of Sport*
39 *Communication*, 3(4), pp. 422-37.
40
41
42 Witkemper, C., Lim, C.H. and Waldburger, A. (2012) "Social media and sports
43 marketing: examining the motivations and constraints of Twitter users", *Sports*
44 *Marketing Quarterly*, 21(3), pp. 170-83.
45
46
47 Yoshida, M., Gordon, B., Nakazawa, M. and Biscaia, R. (2014), "Conceptualization and
48 measurement of fan engagement: empirical evidence from a professional sport
49 context", *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(4), pp. 399-417.
50
51
52 Yoshida, M., Gordon, B.S., Nakazawa, M., Shibuya, S. and Fujiwara, N. (2018),
53 "Bridging the gap between social media and behavioural brand loyalty", *Electronic*
54 *Commerce Research and Applications*, 28, pp. 208-18.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship

Table 1 – Sample characterization

		% of the whole sample (n=214)	% of stadium attendance fans (n=104)	% of mediated attendance fans (n=108)
Gender	Male	80.4%	85.6%	76.9%
	Female	19.6%	14.4%	23.1%
Age	15-24	48.2%	46.2%	50.9%
	25-34	26.2%	31.7%	20.4%
	35-44	10.3%	9.6%	11.1%
	45-54	13.1%	10.6%	14.8%
	More than 55	0.5%	1.9%	2.8%
Area of Residence	Porto (FCP city) region	86.0%	92.3%	81.5%
	North of Portugal regions	6.1%	4.8%	5.6%
	Other regions	7.9%	2.9%	2.9%
Average time spent on Facebook	Don't use Facebook	1.9%	2.9%	0.9%
	Less than 30 minutes	32.2%	32.7%	32.4%
	30 minutes to one hour	32.7%	32.7%	33.3%
	One to two hours	21.0%	17.3%	24.1%
	More than two hours	12.1%	14.4%	9.3%
Average time spent on Instagram	Don't use Instagram	10.7%	8.7%	13.0%
	Less than 30 minutes	24.3%	25.0%	24.1%
	30 minutes to one hour	20.6%	23.1%	17.6%
	One to two hours	25.7%	26.9%	24.1%
	More than two hours	18.7%	16.3%	21.3%
FCP Membership	Yes	61.2%	89.4%	35.2%
	No	38.8%	10.6%	64.8%
SNS in which the fan follows FCP page	Facebook (only) FCP followers	24,8%	18.3%	31.5%
	Instagram (only) FCP followers	6.1%	7.7%	3.7%
	FCP followers on Facebook and Instagram	69,2%	74.0%	64.8%
Predominant way of following FCP matches	On the stadium	48.6%	100%	-
	Television	43.0%	-	85,2%
	Internet / social media	7.4%	-	14.8%
	Doesn't follow games	0.9%	-	-

Table 2 – Measurement model: item means and standard deviations; CFA standardized weights (λ), average variance extracted (AVE), construct reliability (CR) and Cronbach alpha (α)

Facebook (n=201)			Instagram (n=161)			
	λ	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	λ		
Motivations (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree)						
Social Influence (Azar et al., 2016; Shu & Chuang, 2011)						
AVE=.719	.780	4.62 (2.01)	By interacting with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page, I feel I am part of a community.	4.58 (2.06)	.845	AVE=.770
CR=.911	.825	3.89 (2.12)	I interact with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page to state my interests and preferences to my friends.	4.24 (2.09)	.926	CR=.930
α =.910	.908	3.62 (1.92)	My interaction with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page allows me to increase my social involvement.	3.96 (2.03)	.912	α =.927
	.874	3.39 (1.96)	I interact with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page to share my thoughts online with other users.	3.74 (2.11)	.823	
Search for Information (Azar et al., 2016)						
AVE=.755	.917	3.89 (1.96)	My interaction with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page allows me to better understand the brand.	4.53 (2.01)	.917	AVE=.782
CR=.902	.893	3.84 (1.98)	I like to interact with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page because it allows me to find out the opinions of other consumers about the brand.	4.20 (2.07)	.904	CR=.915
α =.899	.792	4.32 (1.92)	My interaction with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page gives me convenient access to information.	4.70 (1.94)	.829	α =.911
Entertainment (Azar et al., 2016; Jahn & Kunz, 2012)						
AVE=.729	.691	3.65 (1.97)	I like to interact with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page to occupy my spare time.	4.41 (1.87)	.762	AVE=.796
CR=.914	.829	4.33 (1.95)	It is interesting to interact with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page.	4.83 (1.85)	.872	CR=.939
α =.907	.916	4.80 (1.68)	The content of FCP Facebook's/Instagram's page is fun.	5.13 (1.69)	.953	α =.937
	.956	4.87 (1.71)	The content of FCP Facebook's/Instagram's page is entertaining.	5.17 (1.77)	.967	
Conversation (Enginkaya & Yilmaz, 2014)						
AVE=.739	.823	4.37 (1.91)	To me, FCP Facebook's/Instagram's pages are a very convenient tool for customers to transmit their complaints and suggestions to the brands.	4.20 (2.09)	.905	AVE=.779
CR=.895	.904	4.10 (1.85)	I think it is possible to communicate instantly with FCP on their Facebook's/Instagram's page without any time and space boundaries.	4.15 (1.96)	.889	CR=.914
α =.892	.850	4.38 (1.83)	Getting in contact with FCP is easy through their Facebook's/Instagram's page because it is simple and free.	4.34 (1.96)	.853	α =.914
Reward (Azar et al., 2016)						
AVE=.827	.859	2.78 (1.90)	I interact with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page in order to access discounts and promotions.	3.22 (2.10)	.946	AVE=.922
CR=.905	.957	2.90 (1.92)	I like to interact with FCP on its Facebook's/Instagram's page as they offer contests and game from which I can access free products or other special offers.	3.42 (2.13)	.974	CR=.959
α =.902						α =.959
Engagement Behaviors (1=never to 7=always)						
Consuming (Tsai & Men, 2013)						
AVE=.758	.860	5.11 (1.70)	Watching videos on FCP Facebook's/Instagram's page.	5.94 (1.47)	.887	AVE=.767
CR=.904	.887	4.67 (1.71)	Viewing pictures on FCP Facebook's/Instagram's page.	5.26 (1.84)	.792	CR=.907
α =.903	.865	4.91 (1.80)	Reading FCP Facebook's/Instagram's posts, user comments, or products reviews.	5.64 (1.59)	.941	α =.898
Contributing (Tsai & Men, 2013)						

AVE=0.655		2.65	<i>Engaging in conversations on FCP</i>	3.28	.884	AVE=.744
CR=0.884	.784	(1.85)	<i>Facebook's/Instagram's page (e.g., commenting, asking, and answering questions)</i>	(2.19)		CR=.921
α =.882						α =0.920
	.848	3.20	<i>Sharing FCP Facebook's/Instagram's page posts on my own Facebook page (e.g., video, audio, pictures, texts)</i>	3.37	.922	
		(1.88)		(2.24)		
	.805	3.23	<i>Recommending FCP Facebook's/Instagram's page to my Facebook or Instagram connections</i>	3.75	.811	
		(2.13)		(2.29)		
	.800	3.55	<i>Uploading FCP-related video, audio, pictures or images on my Facebook's/Instagram's page.</i>	3.96	.829	
		(2.00)		(2.19)		
$\chi^2=512.54$ (209 df); $p=.00$						$\chi^2=574.49$ (209 df); $p=.00$
CFI=.928						CFI=.912
TLI=.913						TLI=.893
RMSEA=.085						RMSEA=.110
SRMR=.062						SRMR=.081

← Model fit →

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3 – AVEs (in brackets) and squared correlations among constructs

Facebook (n=201)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Social Influence	(.719)						
2. Information	.692	(.755)					
3. Entertainment	.573	.651	(.729)				
4. Conversation	.545	.623	.607	(.739)			
5. Reward	.469	.429	.343	.461	(.827)		
6. Consuming	.437	.424	.602	.360	.248	(.758)	
7. Contributing	.590	.503	.296	.306	.326	.376	(.655)
Instagram (n=161)							
1. Social Influence	(.770)						
2. Information	.764	(.782)					
3. Entertainment	.396	.602	(.796)				
4. Conversation	.579	.723	.410	(.779)			
5. Reward	.496	.489	.266	.584	(.922)		
6. Consuming	.304	.449	.564	.317	.217	(.767)	
7. Contributing	.454	.454	.254	.466	.551	.270	(.744)

Table 4 – Impact of motivations on content consumption on Facebook and Instagram

Independent Variables	Facebook (n=201)			Instagram (n=161)		
	β	t	p	β	t	p
Social Influence	.199*	2.12	.035	.020	.195	.845
Search for Information	-.015	-.148	.882	.140	1.04	.299
Entertainment	.587**	5.98	.000	.543**	5.55	.000
Conversation	-.023	-.286	.775	.026	.260	.795
Reward	-.004	-.059	.953	.040	.481	.631
			R ² =.518			R ² =.521
<i>Dependent Variable: Consuming</i>	** $p < .01$	* $p < .05$				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 5 –Impact of motivations on contribution with content on Facebook and Instagram

Independent Variables	Facebook (n=201)			Instagram (n=161)		
	β	t	p	β	T	p
Social Influence	.458**	4.76	.000	.212*	2.11	.036
Search for Information	.217*	2.04	.042	.047	.366	.715
Entertainment	-.014	-.142	.887	.038	.405	.686
Conversation	-.067	-.811	.418	.136	1.43	.155
Reward	.165*	2.37	.019	.406**	5.02	.000
			R ² =.492			R ² =.556
<i>Dependent Variable: Contributing</i>	** $p < .01$	* $p < .05$				

Table 6 – Results (means and standard deviations), by group, in the subscales of the Motivation Scale for Sports Consumption and independent samples t tests.

		Stadium attendance fans (n=104)	Mediated attendance fans (n=108)	<i>t</i> (199 df)
Vicarious achievement	<i>mean</i>	6.51	5.96	3.67**
	<i>sd</i>	0.94	1.24	
Aesthetics	<i>mean</i>	6.35	5.77	3.92**
	<i>sd</i>	0.99	1.17	
Drama	<i>mean</i>	4.69	4.49	1.03
	<i>sd</i>	1.41	1.38	
Escape	<i>mean</i>	5.59	5.08	2.35*
	<i>sd</i>	1.52	1.65	
Knowledge	<i>mean</i>	5.25	4.69	2.69**
	<i>sd</i>	1.52	1.55	
Physical skills	<i>mean</i>	6.45	6.06	3.00**
	<i>sd</i>	0.92	1.00	
Social	<i>mean</i>	5.69	5.05	3.04**
	<i>sd</i>	1.38	1.67	
** <i>p</i> ≤ .01	* <i>p</i> ≤ .05			

Table 7 – Results of the hierarchical linear regression to assess group moderation

Dependent variable: Consumption of content on Facebook			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Predictor variable:	β	β	B
Social Influence (FB)	.197*	.189*	.507**
Search for Information (FB)	-.018	-.032	-.272
Entertainment (FB)	.591**	.563**	.697**
Conversation (FB)	-.022	.021	-.031
Reward (FB)	-.005	-.012	-.084
Group		.100	.375*
Social Influence (FB) \times group			-.746**
Search for Inform (FB) \times group			.566
Entertainment (FB) \times group			-.518
Conversation (FB) \times group			.289
Reward (FB) \times group			.074
R ²	.718	.724	.749
F for change in R ²	41.277**	3.680	3.077*
Dependent variable: Contribution on Facebook			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Predictor variable:	β	β	B
Social Influence (FB)	.456	.453	.580
Search for Information (FB)	.215	.209	.256
Entertainment (FB)	-.013	-.024	-.253
Conversation (FB)	-.067	-.049	-.024
Reward (FB)	.164	.161	.197
Group		.040	-.091
Social Influence (FB) \times group			-.273
Search for Inform (FB) \times group			-.101
Entertainment (FB) \times group			.643
Conversation (FB) \times group			-.086
Reward (FB) \times group			-.061
R ²	.699	.700	.825
F for change in R ²	37.056**	.540	.825
Dependent variable: Consumption of content on Instagram			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Predictor variable:	β	β	B
Social Influence (IG)	.022	.014	.146
Search for Information (IG)	.135	.134	.117
Entertainment (IG)	.553**	.552**	.528**
Conversation (IG)	.023	.032	.065
Reward (IG)	.033	.032	-.058
Group		.021	.098
Social Influence (IG) \times group			-.345
Search for Inform (IG) \times group			.052
Entertainment (IG) \times group			.110
Conversation (IG) \times group			-.084
Reward (IG) \times group			.173
R ²	.722	.723	.727
F for change in R ²	33.395**	.132	.413
Dependent variable: Contribution on Instagram			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Predictor variable:	B	β	B
Social Influence (IG)	.239*	.189	.204
Search for Information (IG)	.039	.033	.130
Entertainment (IG)	.048	.040	-.041
Conversation (IG)	.121	.177	.033
Reward (IG)	.391**	.388**	.426**
Group		.136*	-.066
Social Influence (IG) \times group			-.042
Search for Inform (IG) \times group			-.291
Entertainment (IG) \times group			.285
Conversation (IG) \times group			.349
Reward (IG) \times group			-.090
R ²	.744	.755	.765
F for change in R ²	37.971**	5.938	.567

** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

Table 8 – Impact of motivations on content consumption on Facebook’s FCP page by group

Independent Variables	Stadium attendance fans (n=96)			Mediated attendance fans (n=104)		
	β	t	p	β	T	p
Social Influence	-.039	-.278	.781	.460**	3.590	.001
Search for Information	.147	.938	.351	-.261	-1.938	.056
Entertainment	.405**	2.714	.008	.666**	4.941	.000
Conversation	.192	1.239	.219	-.030	-.308	.759
Reward	-.020	-.179	.858	-.074	-.874	.384
			$R^2=.424$			$R^2=.620$
<i>Dependent Variable: Consuming – Facebook</i>		<i>**p<=.01</i>	<i>*p<=.05</i>			

Table 9 –Impact of motivations on content contribution on Facebook’s FCP page by group

Independent Variables	Stadium attendance fans (n=96)			Mediated attendance fans (n=104)		
	β	t	p	β	t	p
Social Influence	.406**	3.193	.002	.546**	3.585	.001
Search for Information	.183	1.280	.204	.256	1.595	.114
Entertainment	.150	1.102	.273	-.251	-1.564	.121
Conversation	-.088	-.624	.534	-.024	-.210	.834
Reward	.156	1.525	.131	.182	1.796	.076
			R ² =.519			R ² =.463
Dependent Variable: Contributing - Facebook		** $p < .01$		* $p < .05$		

Table 10 –Impact of motivations on content consumption on Instagram’s FCP page by group

Independent Variables	Stadium attendance fans (n=85)			Mediated attendance fans (n=74)		
	β	t	p	β	t	p
Social Influence	-.106	-.695	.489	.140	.875	.385
Search for Information	.156	.787	.434	.114	.600	.550
Entertainment	.622**	4.414	.000	.500**	3.494	.001
Conversation	.004	.026	.979	.057	.385	.701
Reward	.102	.869	.387	-.056	-.431	.668
			$R^2=.549$			$R^2=.501$
<i>Dependent Variable: Consuming - Instagram</i>		<i>**$p < .01$</i>		<i>*$p < .05$</i>		

Table 11 –Impact of motivations on content contribution on Instagram’s FCP page by group

Independent Variables	Stadium attendance fans (n=85)			Mediated attendance fans (n=74)		
	β	t	p	β	t	p
Social Influence	.166	1.127	.263	.218	1.436	.156
Search for Information	-.068	-.353	.725	.142	.787	.434
Entertainment	.125	.918	.361	-.043	-.316	.753
Conversation	.277	1.927	.057	.032	.227	.821
Reward	.335**	2.961	.004	.457**	3.726	.000
			$R^2=.577$			$R^2=.548$
<i>Dependent Variable: Contributing – Instagram</i>			<i>**p<=.01</i>			<i>*p<=.05</i>

Appendix

Appendix 1 – Items of the Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption (Trail & James, 2001; Trail et al., 2003)

Constructs and items	Cronbach α
Vicarious Achievement	
I feel a personal sense of achievement when FCP does well;	
I feel like I have won when the FCP team wins;	0.884
I feel proud when the FCP team plays well.	
Aesthetics	
I appreciate the beauty inherent in a game of football played by FCP;	
I enjoy the natural beauty of a football game;	0.875
I enjoy the gracefulness associated with a FCP game.	
Drama	
I enjoy the drama of a FCP close game;	
I prefer watching a close game rather than a FCP-sided game;	0.756
I enjoy it when the outcome of a FCP game is not decided until the very end.	
Escape	
A FCP game provides an escape for me from my day-to-day routine;	
Going to FCP games is a change of pace from what I regularly do;	0.905
A FCP game provides a diversion from “life’s little problems” for me.	
Knowledge	
I increase my knowledge about football at FCP games;	
I increase my understanding of football strategy by watching a FCP game;	0.950
I can learn about the technical aspects of football by watching a FCP game.	
Physical Skills	
The athletic skills of the FCP players are something I appreciate;	
I enjoy watching a well-executed athletic performance by a FCP player;	0.884
I enjoy a skillful performance by the FCP team.	
Social	
I enjoy interacting with other spectators at the FCP game;	
I enjoy talking with others at FCP games;	0.954
I enjoy socializing with people sitting near me at FCP games.	