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In an effort to better understand the sport consumption behaviors of spectators/fans at a sporting event, Trail, Anderson, and Fink (2005) developed the Model of Sport Spectator Conative Loyalty (MSSCL). Their findings provided sport marketers with more effective tools for marketing strategies by supplying them with an understanding of the sport consumption behavior process of conative loyalty (purchase intentions). The purpose of our research was to propose and test a revised MSSCL that included additional constructs in an effort to explain more variance in conative loyalty on two groups: Latinos and Non-Latinos. Additional constructs (ethnic identity, identification with the dominant group, vicarious achievement, and past behaviors) were added to the Model of Sport Spectator Conative Loyalty.

Trail et al. (2005) used identity theory, self-esteem theory, and satisfaction theory to propose three different conative loyalty models (Models A, B & C). Model A was theoretically justified through Oliver's (1997) consumer satisfaction theory and Ervin and Stryker's (2001) identity theory. In Model A, Trail et al. (2005) showed that (dis)confirmation of expectancies influenced the mood of an individual (satisfaction, negative mood, and positive mood), and mood influenced conative loyalty. Furthermore, the authors found that team identification influenced self-esteem responses (basking in reflected glory [BIRGing] and cutting off reflected failure [CORFing]), which in turn influenced conative loyalty. About 41% of the variance in conative loyalty was explained by Model A. Similarly, Model B was based on consumer satisfaction theory and identity theory, but also was guided by sport consumer behavior research. Trail et al. (2005) determined that (dis)confirmation influenced mood, mood and identification both influenced self-esteem responses (BIRGing and CORFing), and self-esteem responses influenced conative loyalty. Model B explained 49% of the variance in conative loyalty. Finally, Trail et al. (2005) determined that Model C was not tenable. Based on these results, Trail et al. (2005) chose Model B and suggested future research should study variables that could be added to the model to explain at least some of the remaining 51% of the variance in conative loyalty.

Harrolle and Trail (2007) found that a moderate relationship existed between ethnic identity and identification with the dominant culture (acculturation; r = .412). Furthermore, Asbridge, Tanner, and Wortley (2005) found that ethnic identity and acculturation had an influence on consumption behaviors. Thus, we propose that ethnic identity and acculturation will be correlated and both will have a direct influence on conative loyalty.

Recently, Trail, Kwon, and Lee (2007) found that vicarious achievement explained approximately 15% of the variance in team identification. Vicarious achievement was also found to be positively correlated with CORFing in a failure situation, but not correlated with BIRGing in a success situation. Based on identity theory, self-esteem theory, and the above information, we propose that vicarious achievement will influence self-esteem behaviors (BIRGing and CORFing) directly, but also indirectly through team identification.

Trail, Anderson, and Lee (2006) showed that past attendance explained 21% of the variance in team identification and approximately 25% of the variance in conative loyalty. Thus, based on identity theory and Trail et al.'s (2006) findings, we propose that past behavior will predict present team identification and conative loyalty, in addition to the variables already proposed by Trail et al. (2005).

Using an intercept method, all attendees at three out of six entrances at a Major League Baseball Game were asked to fill out the questionnaire until all 400 questionnaires were distributed; 80 individuals declined to participate in the study, and 108 individuals did not completely fill out the questionnaire, resulting in a 62.5% completion rate. The participants were Latinos (n = 127) and Non-Latinos (n = 186). The sample was 54% male and 46% female. The average age of the participants was 44 years, and 65% were married.

The questionnaire was comprised of the following ten scales: Team Identification Index (TII; Trail & James, 2001), (Dis)Confirmation of Expectancies Scale (DCES; Trail et al., 2005), Affective State Index (ASI; Trail, Fink, & Anderson, 2003), Self-Esteem Maintenance Behavioral Scale (SEMSB; Trail et al., 2003), Intentions for Sport Consumption Behavior Scale (ISCBS; Trail et al., 2003), Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Roberts et al., 1999), Abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AMAS; Zee et al., 2003), Vicarious Achievement Subscale (VAS; Trail & James, 2001), Points of Attachment Index (PAI; Robinson & Trail, 2005), and Past Behaviors and Estimated Future Sport Consumption Behaviors Index. All of the scales have been previously shown to be valid and reliable.
Using SEM, the revised MSSCL (Models A & B) were tested for goodness of fit using EQS (2005). When the total sample was studied, the structural model for Revised Model A showed good fit (RMSEA, ŶOa = 0.060; ŶO2/df = 2456.16/1152 = 2.13), but 28.0% of the residuals exceeded .10 indicating that the fit could be improved (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). When the total sample was studied, the structural model for Revised Model B also showed good fit (RMSEA, ŶOa = 0.060; ŶO2/df = 2441.24/1152 = 2.12), but 26.0% of the residuals exceeded .10.

For the total, Latino, and Non-Latino samples, the model fit analysis for Revised Model A and Revised Model B were almost exactly the same in terms of model fit. The variance explained in Conative Loyalty in Revised Model B (59.4%) was slightly higher than in Revised Model A (54.0%) for the total sample and for the Non-Latino sample (55.0% and 53.0%, respectively). In the Latino sample it was the same (63.2%). Because Model B was slightly better in terms of variance explained for two of the three samples, Model B was used in further analysis.

The amount of variance explained in Conative Loyalty for the Revised Model B for the sample was higher than the 49% of variance explained in the original model (Trail et al., 2005) and the 11% of variance explained in Trail et al.’s (2003) conative loyalty model. The differences in the amount of variance explained may be due to the additional variables in the revised models, primarily vicarious achievement.

Regardless of their level of identification with the team, spectators and fans want to BIRG, and these BIRGing behaviors lead to a higher intention to consumer more sport products, thus marketers should provide opportunities for BIRGing behaviors. For example, photo opportunities should be arranged before and after the game with a famous player or mascot thus increasing identification with the team and providing a BIRGing opportunity for the fan. Using current technology, marketers could go one step further and take digital photos and send them via email to the fan, therefore reinforcing identification with the team through email. Additionally, tangible items that fans can take home that express BIRGing behaviors could improve conative loyalty. For example, providing t-shirts that associate a fan with the successful team (e.g., T-shirt slogan: "I am a member of the 2007 National Championship team").