


5-2010

Potential Factors That Influence Team Identification: A Desire to be Similar or Different?

Courtney A. Clippert

Western Kentucky University, courtney.clippert270@wku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#), [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Clippert, Courtney A., "Potential Factors That Influence Team Identification: A Desire to be Similar or Different?" (2010). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 148.

<http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/148>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

POTENTIAL FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE TEAM IDENTIFICATION: A DESIRE
TO BE SIMILAR OR DIFFERENT?

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

By
Courtney A. Clippert

May 2010

POTENTIAL FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE TEAM IDENTIFICATION: A DESIRE
TO BE SIMILAR OR DIFFERENT?

Date Recommended 4/8/2010

Frederick G. Grieve, Ph.D.
Director of Thesis

Sarah Ostrowski, Ph.D.

W. Pitt Derryberry, Ph.D.

Dean, Graduate Studies and Research Date

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my Dad and Mom for their constant love, support, and guidance throughout my life. Also, I would like to thank my mentor, Dr. Rick Grieve, for all of his support, guidance, and knowledge throughout my experience in graduate school. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Sarah Ostrowski and Dr. Pitt Derryberry for their time, help, and suggestions. Last, but not least, I would like to thank Tread and my friends for all of their unconditional support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgements..... | i |
| Table of Contents..... | ii |
| List of Tables..... | iv |
| Abstract..... | v |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Method | 11 |
| Participants..... | 11 |
| Design..... | 12 |
| Measures..... | 14 |
| Demographics..... | 14 |
| Sport Fandom..... | 14 |
| Team Identification..... | 14 |
| Gambling Protocol..... | 15 |
| Procedure..... | 15 |
| Results..... | 16 |
| Discussion | 22 |
| References | 26 |
| Appendices | |
| A. Need for Affiliation (nAff)..... | 31 |
| B. Demographics..... | 33 |
| C. Sport Fandom Questionnaire (SFQ)..... | 35 |
| D. Modified Sport Spectator Identification Scale (SSIS)..... | 37 |

| | |
|--|----|
| E. Gambling Protocol..... | 40 |
| F. Informed Consent Document..... | 42 |
| G. Debriefing Statement..... | 44 |
| H. Human Subjects Review Board Approval..... | 46 |

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | nAff and Sport Fandom by Condition..... | 17 |
| 2 | Amount of Money Wagered and Identification for Teams..... | 18 |
| 3 | Likelihood of Wagering on Teams..... | 19 |
| 4 | Correlation of Dependent Variables | 20 |

POTENTIAL FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE TEAM IDENTIFICATION: A DESIRE
TO BE SIMILAR OR DIFFERENT?

Courtney Clippert

May 2010

47 Pages

Directed by: Dr. Frederick Grieve, Dr. Sarah Ostrowski, and Dr. W. Pitt Derryberry

Department of Psychology

Western Kentucky University

The purpose of the current study is to determine whether eliciting the need for assimilation or the need for differentiation influences individuals' identification with a given team. Team identification is defined as a fan's psychological connection to a team; that is, the extent to which the fan views the team as an extension of him or herself (Wann, Melnick, Russell, & Pease, 2001). It is important to understand potential factors that may motivate and potentially increase one's identification with a particular team.

The sample consisted of 106 participants attending Western Kentucky University. The participants completed the Sport Fandom Questionnaire (SFQ) and the Need for Affiliation (nAff) scale. Participants were presented with one of three randomly assigned scenarios, and were asked to transcribe two memories, dependent upon the previously assigned scenario. Following this, the gambling scenario was described. Participants rated how identified they were with both the underdog and favored team, regardless of their choice. It was hypothesized that those who are primed to experience the feelings of assimilation will wager more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a prohibitive favorite. Also, it was hypothesized that those who are primed to experience the feelings of differentiation will wager more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a large underdog.

Results indicated that the hypotheses were not supported; however, significance was approached, as participants who were primed for feelings of differentiation tended to choose the underdog football team. Regardless of condition, participants tended to wager more money on the favorite football team, as opposed to the underdog football team.

Introduction

Over the past two decades, there has been an increased interest in research regarding the psychological attachment that sport spectators form to teams. There are various forms of attachment that are identified by sport spectators, with the most common being team identification, commitment, and loyalty (Backman & Crompton, 1991; Mahoney, Madrigal, & Howard, 2000; Wann & Branscombe, 1993; Wann & Pierce, 2005). Furthermore, researchers are interested in the benefits that are obtained by identifying with a particular team. As this field of interest is expanding, researchers have conducted studies to determine what team identification is, and more specifically, what the benefits of team identification are; however, there is a lack of literature that identifies factors that motivate and potentially increase one's identification with a team.

Team Identification

Team identification is defined as a fan's psychological connection to a team; that is, the extent to which the fan views the team as an extension of him or herself (Wann, Melnick, Russell, & Pease, 2001). Furthermore, numerous authors suggest that there is a relationship between team identification and psychological health and well-being (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Eastman & Land, 1997; Melnick, 1993; Pan, Gabert, McGaugh, & Banvold, 1997; Wann, 2006a; Wann, 2006b; Wann, Dimmock, & Grove, 2003; Wann, Dunham, Byrd, & Keenan, 2004; Zillmann, Bryant, & Sapolsky, 1989). Numerous empirical investigations have been conducted by Wann and his colleagues in order to test this assumption (see Wann, 2006b, for a review). Results from such studies indicate that there is a positive relationship between team identification and psychological health (Wann, 2006b). Research findings suggest that when an individual

is highly identified with a team, that individual is also connected with a larger social group (Wann, 2006b). Wann (2006b) suggests that, as a result, this individual forms connections with other members of society and displays a healthier psychological profile (e.g., higher self-esteem, less frequency of depression) than those who are not identified with a team.

After combining research findings from empirical investigations, Wann (2006b) developed the Team Identification – Social Psychological Health Model (TI-SPH) to further explain the relationship between team identification and psychological health. The three predictions contained in the model include: high levels of identification with a local sport team lead to positive psychological health; high levels of identification with a distant sport team are not sufficient to garner the psychological well-being effects; and high levels of mere sport fandom are not sufficient to garner the psychological well-being effects (Wann, 2006b). Although there is evidence to support this relationship, the direction of the relationship has yet to be determined. In other words, it has not been determined whether high levels of team identification lead to better psychological health, or if better psychological health leads to higher identification (Wann, 2006b).

Wann et al. (2004) conducted a study that examined the relationship between participants' identification with a team and their scores on the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO PI-R). For the purpose of this study, the scores on the NEO PI-R were used to determine participants' psychological health. The NEO PI-R assesses five domains of personality, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. The Neuroticism domain assesses the degree of emotional stability and adjustment. The Extraversion domain reflects the degree to which an individual is

“assertive, active, and talkative” by assessing both introversion and extroversion (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 15). The Openness domain reflects how open an individual is to new and imaginative ideas and activities. The Agreeableness domain assesses an individual’s level of altruism and cooperativeness. Conscientiousness reflects an individual’s self-control and goal oriented direction (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Consistent with their predictions, Wann et al. (2004) discovered that identification with a local sport team was positively correlated with psychological well-being, as evidenced by the scores on the Extraversion, Openness, and Conscientiousness scales of the NEO PI-R. Furthermore, identification with a distant sport team was not significantly correlated with psychological well-being. Findings from other studies suggest that high levels of team identification are related to higher personal and social self-esteem (Branscombe & Wann, 1991), less alienation and depression, more positive and fewer negative emotions, more vigor, less fatigue, confusion, anger, and tension (Wann & Pierce, 2005; Wann, Walker, Cygan, Kawase, & Ryan, 2005), and higher levels of extroversion, openness, and conscientiousness (Wann et al., 2004).

Wann and his colleagues have also conducted research examining the relationship between team identification and social well-being. Wann and Pierce (2005) demonstrated that there was an association between higher levels of team identification and greater levels of satisfaction with one’s social life. To further investigate this relationship, Wann and Weaver (2009) conducted a study based upon Wann’s (2006b) TI-SPH model. As expected, results revealed that, higher levels of team identification were significantly correlated with two dimensions of social well-being: social integration (one’s connection to the community at large) and social coherence. Keyes (1998) defined

social coherence as perceptions that a person's social world is predictable and understandable and is "analogous to meaningfulness in life" (p. 123).

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (ODT)

Optimal distinctiveness theory (ODT) posits that social identity is driven by two fundamental human needs--the need for assimilation and the need for differentiation (Brewer, 1991). Moreover, the need for assimilation translates into the need for group inclusion and belonging, while the need for differentiation translates into the need for individuation. The ODT focuses on the motivation that underlies social identification, and posits that social identities possess a role in achieving and maintaining a stable self-concept (Brewer & Pickett, 1999).

The ODT posits that there is conflict between the two fundamental human needs (Brewer, 1991). For example, individuals experiencing higher levels of group inclusiveness experience minimal arousal related to the need for assimilation; however, these individuals experience high arousal related to the need for differentiation. Conversely, individuals experiencing higher levels of group exclusion experience minimal arousal related to the need for differentiation; however, these individuals experience high arousal related to the need for assimilation. According to ODT, individuals experiencing such conflict between these two fundamental human needs oftentimes identify with social groups in order to alleviate the conflict (Brewer, 1991; Pickett, Silver, & Brewer, 2002).

By identifying with social groups, individuals form new social identities and connect with others besides themselves. In addition, it is suggested that group membership satisfies both needs by eliciting feelings of assimilation with the in-group

members while eliciting feelings of differentiation through intergroup comparisons; that is, allowing for an optimal balance between the two fundamental human needs (Dimmock & Gucciardi, 2008).

Factors that Influence Team Identification

In order to better understand team identification, it is important to examine the factors that influence identification with a given team. Over the years, this type of research has identified factors that influence team identification. Within this field of research, people are interested in team identification, as it is a strong predictor of sport fan consumption behavior (Fink, Trail, & Anderson, 2002). Findings suggest that those who are highly identified with a team are more likely to attend games, pay more for tickets, spend more money on team merchandise, and remain loyal to their team regardless of poor performance (Madrigal, 1995; Wakefield, 1995; Wann & Branscombe, 1993).

Findings suggest that identification with a team provides a source of entertainment, thus relieving boredom (Zillman et al., 1989). In addition, several researchers have suggested that there are certain psychological motives that are related to fan identification (Fink et al., 2002; Trail & James, 2001; Wann, 1995). Fink et al. (2002) identified nine motives that were based upon social and psychological needs. Those social and psychological needs include the following: vicarious achievement (the need for social prestige, self-esteem and sense of empowerment that individuals can receive from their association with a successful team), aesthetics (the artistic appreciation of the sport due to its inherent beauty), drama (the need to experience pleasurable stress or stimulation gained from the drama of the event), escape (the need to find a diversion

from work and the normal, unexciting activity of everyday life), family (the opportunity to spend time with one's family doing something everyone enjoys), acquisition of knowledge (the need to learn about the team or players through interaction and media consumption), appreciation of physical skills of the athletes (the appreciation of the physical skill of the athletes or the well-executed performance of the team), social interaction (the need to interact and socialize with others of like interests to achieve feelings that one is part of a group), and physical attraction to the athletes (watching sports because of the physical attractiveness or "sex appeal" of an individual athlete or group of athletes). In addition, it was expected that the identified nine motives were predictive of team identification (Fink et al., 2002).

Previous researchers, such as Wann (1995) and Trail and James (2001), identified significant relationships, and lack thereof, between motives and team identification. For example, Wann (1995) and Trail and James (2001) found that there was a small correlation between the physical attractiveness motive and team identification. Comparatively, Wann (1995) found similar results between the family motive and team identification. Further, some motives, as compared to others, are more prominent to the development of team identification. Fink et al. (2002) suggest that certain motives, such as vicarious achievement and self-esteem that people derive from becoming members of groups/teams/organizations are highly related with identification. In other words, it is more likely that one will identify with a particular team if he or she is yearning for a sense of achievement from that connection (Fink et al., 2002). Fink et al. (2002) found that eight of the nine motives they identified were significantly correlated with team

identification. The family motive was the only motive not significantly correlated with team identification (Fink et al., 2002).

However, it is important to note that there may be moderating variables (i.e., gender) that could explain differences in the relationships between motives and identification. There are mixed findings when examining gender differences between motives and team identification (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Wann & Branscombe, 1993; Wann, Tucker, & Schrader, 1996). For example, there are studies that suggest that there are no gender differences among levels of team identification, while other studies suggest that males tend to exhibit higher levels of identification.

Limitations of Previous Research

While there is substantial literature on team identification, there is a lack of research that identifies factors that motivate and potentially increase one's identification with a team. Most research has focused on what the benefits are of being identified with a team. Furthermore, although there is literature on the ODT, the research focuses on the formation of social identities. Specifically, there is a lack of research examining if, and how, the ODT motivates and potentially increases one's identification with a team.

Current study

The purpose of the current study is to determine whether eliciting the need for assimilation or the need for differentiation influences individuals' identification with a given team. It is expected that those in the affiliation condition will choose the favorite team because more people root for the favorite team. Conversely, it is expected that those in the differentiation condition will choose the underdog team because fewer people root for the underdog team. The gambling protocol created for this study used fictional

teams that were created with no historical basis. Participants were asked to gamble. When participants made their decision which team to support, it was expected that the only basis for their decisions would be their emotional state from the priming exercise to select the team and wager their money.

Two hypotheses will be evaluated in this current study. Hypothesis 1 states that those who are primed to experience the feelings of assimilation will wager more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a prohibitive favorite. Hypothesis 2 states that those who are primed to experience the feelings of differentiation will wager more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a large underdog.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 106 participants. Of the 106 participants, 70 (66%) were collected through Western Kentucky University's Study Board. The other 36 (34%) participants were collected in a psychology class at Western Kentucky University. Of the 106 participants, 47 (44%) were male and 59 (56%) were female. The minimum age of participants was 18 and the maximum age was 45. The mean age of participants was 21.00 ($SD = 5.14$). The sample consisted of 83 (79.0%) Caucasian participants, 21 (20.0%) African American participants, 1 (.9%) participant who specified Other, and 1 (.9%) participant who did not specify ethnicity. The sample contained 1 (.9%) participant who had less than a high school degree, 20 (18.9%) participants who graduated from high school, 75 (70.8%) participants who indicated that they have had some college experience, 4 (3.8%) participants who reported they had an associate's degree, 4 (3.8%) participants had a bachelor's degree, and 2 (1.9%) participants who indicated they completed at least some post bachelors work. Of the participating sample, 30 (28%) reported they currently gamble and 76 (72%) reported that they do not gamble. Of the 30 participants who reported gambling, 6 (5.7%) reported that they gamble one time per week, 11 (10.4%) reported that they gamble one time per month, and 13 (12.3%) reported that they gamble one time per year. The sample contained 63 (59%) participants who participate in sports, and 42 (41%) participants who do not participate in sports. Of the 63 participants who participate in sports, the minimum number of years of participation was 1 and the maximum years of participation was 18. The mean number of years of participation was 8.79 ($SD = 5.10$).

Design

This study used a three group design. The independent variable is the type of feeling that the participant will be primed to experience (i.e., the need to belong, the need to be distinct, and neither the need to belong nor the need to be distinct). The dependent variables are the amount of money wagered on the team that the participant chooses (i.e., the favorite team or the underdog team) and identification with the team selected.

Induction

Participants were given a set of instructions for an activity designed to elicit a particular mood state. The first two sets of instructions were adapted from Picket et al. (2002). The following instructions were presented:

Need for Assimilation Condition. These specific instructions were given for the need for assimilation condition:

Please take a moment and think of times when you felt very different from people. In other words, think of times and situations where you did not feel that you fit in with other people around you and that you “stuck out.” Please write a brief description of two memories of such times.

Need for Differentiation Condition. These specific instructions were given for the need for differentiation condition:

Please take a moment and think of times when you felt overly similar to other people. In other words, think of times and situations where you felt that you were so much like other people around you that

you did not have your own identity. Please write a brief description of two memories of such times.

No Need Arousal Condition. These specific instructions were given for participants in the no need arousal condition:

Please take a moment and think of the last time that you went to the grocery store to buy groceries, and the last time that you purchased gas for your car. Please write a brief description of two memories of such times.

Manipulation Check

Need for Affiliation. Participants were asked to fill out the Need for Affiliation scale (nAff; Buunk, Zurriaga, Peiró, Nauta, & Gosalvez, 2005; See Appendix A). The nAff scale is a 16-item measure. The items are divided into four areas that measure an individual's desire to spend time with others, a lack of desire to spend time with others, a desire to complete tasks alone, and a desire to work with others to complete tasks. Participants indicate their response to each item by circling either *strongly agree* (SA), *agree* (A), *disagree* (D), or *strongly disagree* (SD). Example items on nAff are, "I prefer to go my own way alone," "In my leisure time, I prefer to do things together with others," and "I don't like to undertake something totally on my own." The nAff scale has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .84$ (Buunk et al., 2005). Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .08.

Measures

Demographics. Participants completed a demographics survey that included information about each participant's age, gender, ethnicity, education level, participation in gambling, and participation in sports (See Appendix B).

Sport Fandom. The Sport Fandom Questionnaire (SFQ; Wann, 2002; See Appendix C) is a five-item measure. Participants rate each item on an eight-point Likert-type scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 8 (*strongly agree*). The SFQ assesses the level of sport fandom each participant has with an indicated sport. An example item of the SFQ is, "I consider myself to be a sport fan." Higher ratings for each item, and the higher overall total score for the five items, indicates a higher level of sport fandom. The SFQ has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .96$ (Wann, 2002). Cronbach's alpha for the present study was .92.

Team Identification. The Sport Spectator Identification Scale (SSIS; Wann & Branscombe, 1993; see Appendix D) is a seven-item measure. Participants rate each item on an eight-point Likert-type scale, from 1 (*low identification*) to 8 (*high identification*). The SSIS assesses the level of identification each participant has with an indicated team. An example item of the SSIS is, "How strongly do your friends see you as a fan of this team?" For the purpose of this study, only items 1, 2, and 4 were used. Items 1 and 2 were left as is, and item 4 was modified to read, "If this game was aired for viewing, how closely would you follow the game via ANY of the following: a) in person or on television, b) on the radio, c) television news or a newspaper, and/or d) the Internet?" Higher ratings for each item, and the higher the overall total score for the seven items, indicates a higher level of identification with the indicated team. The SSIS has an

internal consistency of $\alpha = .91$ (Wann & Branscombe, 1993). Cronbach's alpha for the present study was .84 for the favorite team and was .69 for the underdog team.

Gambling Protocol. Participants were given a list of five imaginary football games. Participants were told that they have \$100 to wager on one or more football games. Participants were instructed to circle the team on which that they wanted to bet. In addition, they were instructed to write down how much money they wagered on the team they selected. Participants were able to choose how many games they want to bet on, and, also, how much money they wanted to wager. Of the five football games, only one game depicted a very large point difference. This game was the target game for identification. There was a very small point discrepancy between the teams for the other four games (See Appendix E).

Procedure

Before participating in the study, all participants were given an informed consent document (see Appendix F). The participants were informed about what would take place during the study, and that their participation was strictly voluntary. First, the participants completed the Sport Fandom Questionnaire. Next, they completed the Need for Affiliation scale. Then, the participants were presented with one of three randomly assigned scenarios, and were asked to transcribe two memories, dependent upon the previously assigned scenario. Following this, the gambling scenario was described and participants completed their wagers. Then, they rated how identified they were with both the underdog and favored team, regardless of their choice of teams from that game. After participants completed the task, they were debriefed (see Appendix G).

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Scores from each of the measures were summed to create a total score. Therefore, the 16 items forming the nAff were combined to create a single index of need for affiliation ($M = 40.50$, $SD = 4.18$) that was used as a manipulation check. The five items from the SFQ were combined into a single measure of sport fandom ($M = 18.69$, $SD = 10.02$). The three items for the SSIS were combined to create a single measure of identification for the favorite football team ($M = 12.93$, $SD = 7.16$) and the underdog football team ($M = 10.09$, $SD = 5.91$). There were six participants who did not understand the directions, and did not complete the induction; that is, they failed to write down memories. As a result, these participants were dropped from the analyses.

Manipulation Check

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with Scheffe follow-up tests indicated that there were no differences among groups on either need for affiliation, $F(2, 102) = 0.73$, $p = .49$, or sport fandom, $F(2, 102) = 0.10$, $p = .90$. Please see Table 1 for means and standard deviations.

Table 1:

Means and Standard Deviations for nAff and Sport Fandom by Condition

| Variable | M | SD | N |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|----|
| Need for Affiliation | | | |
| Affiliation | 40.53 | 6.24 | 30 |
| Differentiation | 40.81 | 2.74 | 32 |
| Control | 39.80 | 3.36 | 35 |
| Sport Fandom | | | |
| Affiliation | 19.57 | 10.71 | 30 |
| Differentiation | 18.72 | 10.81 | 32 |
| Control | 18.31 | 9.48 | 35 |

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1 stated that those who are primed to experience the feelings of affiliation will wager more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a prohibitive favorite than those primed to experience feelings of differentiation.

Hypothesis Two stated that those who are primed to experience the feelings of differentiation will wager more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a large underdog than those who are primed to experience feelings of affiliation. To evaluate these hypotheses, a One-Way ANOVA was computed on SSIS scores related to the favorite team and SSIS scores related to the underdog team. Scheffe follow-up analyses were used, when necessary. Results indicated that there were no significant differences between the SSIS scores related to the favorite team $F(2, 100) = .36, p = .70$,

and SSIS scores related to the underdog team $F(2,100) = .41, p = .66$. The favorite football team was chosen 71% of the time when participants were primed for feelings of affiliation, the favorite football team was chosen 55% of the time when participants were primed for feelings of differentiation, and the favorite football team was chosen 76% of the time in the control condition. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 2.

Table 2:

Means and Standard Deviations for the Football Team Chosen in the Affiliation, Differentiation, and Control Condition, the Amount of Money Wagered, Identification for the Favored Team, and Identification for the Underdog Team

| Variable | M | SD |
|--------------------------------|-------|------|
| Percent Choosing Favorite Team | | |
| Affiliation | .71 | .46 |
| Differentiation | .55 | .51 |
| Control | .76 | .44 |
| Favored Team Identification | | |
| Affiliation | 13.49 | 7.41 |
| Differentiation | 13.21 | 7.14 |
| Control | 12.01 | 7.05 |
| Underdog Team Identification | | |
| Affiliation | 10.20 | 5.13 |
| Differentiation | 10.68 | 6.58 |
| Control | 9.38 | 6.06 |

In order to evaluate the amount of money wagered, two independent samples *t*-tests were computed. Participants who selected the favorite team were selected for the first analysis and participants who selected the underdog team were selected for the second analysis. Results indicated that, for participants who wagered on the favorite team, there was no difference in amount of money wagered, $t(35) = -.007, p = .99$, regardless whether the person was in the need for affiliation condition ($M = 52.00, SD = 25.31$) or the need for distinctiveness condition ($M = 52.06, SD = 29.21$). Similarly, results indicated that, for participants who wagered on the underdog team, there was no difference in the amount of money wagered, $t(20) = -1.77, p = .09, d = .15$, between participants in the need for distinctiveness condition ($M = 46.79, SD = 37.03$) and the participants in the need for affiliation condition ($M = 20.31, SD = 26.47$). However, this latter analysis approached significance.

A Chi Square analysis was conducted in order to evaluate whether there was a difference in the likelihood of wagering on teams. As shown in Table 3, results indicated that there was not a difference in the likelihood of wagering on teams, Chi Square = 3.35, $p = .19$.

Table 3:

Likelihood of Wagering on Teams

| Variable | Affiliation | Differentiation |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Favorite Team | 20 | 17 |
| Underdog Team | 8 | 14 |

Pearson's correlations were conducted between demographic variables including: gambling, sport participation, and gender, and the dependent variables of which team was chosen, the amount of money wagered, and identification with each team. As shown in Table 4, results indicated that there were significant correlations between gender and gambling; identification with the favorite team and sports participation and gender; identification with the underdog team and gambling, sports participation, gender, and identification with the favorite team; game 3 and identification with the favorite and underdog team; and the amount of money wagered and identification with the favorite team.

Table 4:

Correlations of Dependent Variables

| | Gamble | Sports | Gender | DD Id | BK Id | Game 3 | Bet | nAff |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-----|------|
| Gamble | ... | .34 | .00 | .91 | .03 | .59 | .13 | .80 |
| Sports | .09 | ... | .23 | .00 | .01 | .11 | .33 | .99 |
| Gender | .37 | .12 | ... | .02 | .00 | .82 | .14 | .77 |
| DD Id | .01 | .28 | .24 | ... | .00 | .00 | .00 | .98 |
| BK Id | .21 | .24 | .32 | .28 | ... | .00 | .08 | .21 |
| Game 3 | -.05 | .17 | -.02 | .45 | .44 | ... | .07 | .48 |
| Bet | -.16 | .10 | .15 | .47 | .19 | .20 | ... | .48 |
| nAff | -.03 | .00 | -.03 | .00 | -.13 | .06 | .07 | ... |

Note: Correlations are under the diagonal; *p*-values are above the diagonal. Gamble = participants who indicated that they gamble; Sports = participants who indicated that they participated in sports; Gender; DD Id = participants' level of identification with the favorite team; BK Id = participants' level of identification with the underdog team; Game 3 = the game between the favorite and underdog team; Bet = the amount of money participants' wagered; nAff = participants' identified level of need for affiliation.

A series of four regression analyses were performed, and there were no relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The demographic variables were entered on the first step and the need for affiliation was entered on the second step. These variables were regressed on each dependent variable.

Discussion

The current study evaluated the Optimal Distinctiveness Theory by examining whether eliciting the need for assimilation or the need for differentiation influences whether individuals identified with a given team. It was expected that individuals who were primed to experience feelings of needing to belong would wager more money and be more highly identified with the favorite football team. Also, it was expected that those who were primed to experience the feelings of needing to be different would wager more money and be more highly identified with the underdog football team.

The first hypothesis, those who are primed to experience the feelings of affiliation will wager more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a prohibitive favorite than those primed to experience feelings of differentiation, was not supported. This suggests that being primed for feelings of affiliation did not increase the likelihood of participants wagering more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a prohibitive favorite. One possibility as to why this occurred is that there is a distinction between choosing and being highly identified with the prohibitive favorite. In other words, one might wager on the prohibitive favorite for reasons other than feelings of identification. Further, being primed for feelings of affiliation may not necessarily increase the level of identification with the team.

Another possibility as to why this occurred is that, although the directions were explained in detail, participants might not have fully understood what a gambling line is. There were several participants who asked for clarification regarding the gambling line. Additionally, several participants proceeded to state after they completed the surveys that they simply circled a team, as they still did not understand the gambling line.

The results of this study were not consistent with previous studies that examine Optimal Distinctiveness Theory. For example, Picket et al. (2002), found that an activation of either the need for affiliation or the need for differentiation increased the importance of distinctive group memberships. In relation to the current study, it was hypothesized that people would place wagers on teams that were dependent on which feeling they were primed to experience. Due to the fact that there were not significant differences between the need for affiliation and need for differentiation condition, the results were not consistent with results from studies in the ODT literature, as researchers have found significant differences between those who experience the need for affiliation and the need for distinctiveness. More specifically, results from the current study found that, regardless of condition, there were not statistical significances regarding the level of identification that participants had for their chosen team, whereas Picket et al. (2002) found an increased level of importance to participants. It is important to note that most ODT studies do not incorporate manipulation checks. The researchers simply assume that the inductions were successful when they find significant differences after.

Additionally, previous studies examining ODT demonstrate that, as a result of either heightened levels of feelings of affiliation or differentiation, participants exhibit particular responses. Results from the current study differed from such findings, as levels of feelings of affiliation or differentiation did not elicit particular responses. Furthermore, research indicates that people have responses that increase the number of similar others or increase intragroup similarity (Picket & Brewer, 2001; Simon et al., 1997). Conversely, research indicates that people have responses that decrease the number of similar others or increase intragroup distinctiveness as the differentiation need

level increases (Picket & Brewer, 2001; Simon et al., 1997). Results from the current study are not consistent with such findings, as, regardless of condition, participants tended to choose the prohibitive favorite, and as a result, did not decrease or increase intragroup similarity.

The second hypothesis, those who are primed to experience the feelings of differentiation will wager more money on and be more highly identified with a team that is a large underdog than those who are primed to experience feelings of affiliation, was partially supported. While an independent samples *t*-test found a trend for those who were primed to experience feelings of affiliation to choose the underdog football team, as opposed to those primed for feelings distinctiveness, it was not statistically significant. Also, the effect size was small, as $d = .15$. Results from the current study do not replicate those results of previous research conducted.

Although this study did not find statistically significant results, it is important to note that, regardless of condition, participants tended to wager more money on the favorite football team, as opposed to the underdog football team. These results are interesting, as they suggest that, overall, people were more willing to wager more money on the favorite football team, simply because the prohibitive favorite is expected to win the game. Also, it suggests that people are more willing to take more of a risk when they believe that the favorite team is expected to win.

There are limitations to the current study. One limitation is that the manipulation check indicates that it is questionable as to whether or not the manipulation worked. There were no differences between the groups regarding scores on the nAff scale. Therefore, using a different manipulation might have yielded different results. Another

limitation is that it is not certain whether the priming exercise worked properly. Therefore, using a different way to prime people for particular feelings might have yielded different results.

Future research may want to recruit participants who gamble, as those who gamble will more than likely know and understand what a gambling line is. Additionally, future research may want to incorporate a mandatory quiz over simple definitions of gambling terms, to help increase the chance that participants will understand the gambling scenario, as many participants in this study did not appear to understand the gambling terminology.

The present study has provided a start for examining potential factors that influence team identification. Regardless of condition, participants wagered more money on the favorite football team, as opposed to the underdog football team. Additionally, it was noted that, participants primed to experience feelings of differentiation tended to choose the underdog football team.

References

- Backman, S. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Differentiating between high, spurious, latent, and loyal participants in two leisure activities. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration: A Publication of the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration*, 9, 1-17.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1991). The positive social and self-concept consequences of sport team identification. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, *15*, 115-127.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 475-482.
- Brewer, M. B., & Pickett, C. L. (1999). Distinctiveness motives as a source of the social self. In T. R. Tyler, R. M. Kramer, & O. P. John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 71-87). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Buunk, B. P., Zurriaga, R., Peiró, J. M., Nauta, A., & Gosalvez, I. (2005). Social comparisons at work as related to a cooperative social climate and to individual differences in social comparison orientation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *54*, 61-80.
- Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO Personality Inventory Revised manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Dimmock, J. A., & Gucciardi, D. F. (2008). The utility of modern theories of intergroup bias for research on antecedents to team identification. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *9*, 284-300.

- Eastman, S. T., & Land, A. M. (1997). The best of both worlds: Sports fans find good seats at the bar. *Journal of Sport & Societal Issues, 21*, 156-178.
- Fink, J. S., Trail, G. T., & Anderson, D. F. (2002). An examination of team identification: Which motives are most salient to its existence. *International Sports Journal, 6*, 195-207.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*, 121-140.
- Madrigal, R. (1995). Cognitive and affective determinants of fan satisfaction with sporting event attendance. *Journal of Leisure Research, 27*, 205-227.
- Melnick, M. J. (1993). Searching for sociability in the stands: A theory of sports spectating. *Journal of Sport Management, 7*, 44-60.
- Mahoney, D. F., Madrigal, R., & Howard, D. (2000). Using the psychological commitment to team (PCT) scale to segment sport consumers based on loyalty. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 9*, 15-25.
- Pan, D. W., Gabert, T. E., McGaugh, E. C., & Branvold, S. E. (1997). Factors and differential demographic effects on purchases of season tickets for intercollegiate basketball games. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 20*, 447-464.
- Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2001). Assimilation and differentiation needs as motivational determinants of perceived in-group and out-group homogeneity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 341-348.
- Pickett, C. L., Silver, M. D., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). The impact of assimilation and differentiation needs on perceived group importance and judgments of ingroup size. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 546-558.

- Simon, L., Greenberg, J., Arndt, J., Pyszczynski, T., Clement, R., & Solomon, S. (1997). Perceived consensus, uniqueness, and terror management: Compensatory responses to threats to inclusion and distinctiveness following mortality salience. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 1055-1065.
- Trail, G. T., & James, J. D. (2001). The motivation scale for sport consumption: Assessment of the scale's psychometric properties. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *24*, 108-127.
- Wakefield, K. L. (1995). The pervasive effects of social influence on sporting event attendance. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *19*, 335-351.
- Wann, D. L. (1995). Preliminary validation of the sport fan motivation scale. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *19*, 377-396.
- Wann, D. L. (2002). Preliminary validation of a measure for assessing identification as a sport fan: The sport fandom questionnaire. *International Journal of Sport Management*, *3*, 103-115.
- Wann, D. L. (2006a). Examining the potential causal relationship between sport team identification and psychological well-being. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *29*, 79-95.
- Wann, D. L. (2006b). Understanding the positive social psychological benefits of sport team identification: The Team Identification-Social Psychological Health Model. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *4*, 272-296.
- Wann, D. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1993). Sports fans: Measuring degree of identification with their team. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, *24*, 1-17.

- Wann, D. L., Dimmock, J. A., & Grove, J. R. (2003). Generalizing the Team Identification-Psychological Health Model to a different sport and culture: The case of Australian rules football. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 7*, 289-296.
- Wann, D. L., Dunham, M. D., Byrd, M. L., & Keenan, B. L. (2004). The five-factor model of personality and the psychological health of highly identified sport fans. *International Sports Journal, 8*, 28-36.
- Wann, D. L., Melnick, M. J., Russell, G. W., & Pease, D. G. (2001). *Sport fans: The psychology and social impact of spectators*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Wann, D. L., & Pierce, S. (2005). Measuring sport team identification and commitment: An empirical comparison of the sport spectator identification scale and the psychological commitment to team scale. *North American Journal of Psychology, 5*, 365-372.
- Wann, D. L., Tucker, K. B., & Schrader, M. P. (1996). An exploratory examination of the factors influencing the origination, continuation, and cessation of identification with sports teams. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 82*, 995-1001.
- Wann, D. L., Walker, R. G., Cygan, J., Kawase, I., & Ryan, J. (2005). Further replication of the relationship between team identification and social psychological well-being: Examining non-classroom settings. *North American Journal of Psychology, 7*, 361-365.
- Wann, D. L., & Weaver, S. (2009). Understanding the relationship between sport team identification and dimensions of social well-being. *North American Journal of Psychology, 11*, 219-230.

Zillmann, D., Bryant, J., & Sapolsky, B. S. (1989). Enjoyment from sports spectatorship.

In J. H. Goldstein (Ed.), *Sports, games, and play: Social and psychological viewpoints* (2nd ed., pp. 241-278). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Appendix A

Need for Affiliation Scale

Directions: Please answer whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) with each of the following statements. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers.

- | | | | | |
|---|---------|--------|--------|---------|
| 1. I like to go to places and settings with lots of people. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 2. I would never want to live completely on my own. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 3. In my leisure time, I prefer to do things together with others. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 4. I cannot stand being alone. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 5. I prefer to go my own way alone. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 6. I really prefer to stay as short a time as possible at occasions where there are lots of people. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 7. When on vacation, I avoid contacts with other vacationers as much as possible. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 8. It is not my thing to undertake something with a group of people | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 9. It sounds awful to have a job in which you are alone in a room the whole day. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 10. I find it stressful to have people around me constantly. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 11. I like to talk to others. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 12. Even when I am in a relationship, I still have a strong need to be alone. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 13. The ideal way to spend my leisure time is to do something on my own. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 14. I like to be alone. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 15. I love teamwork. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |
| 16. I don't like to undertake something totally on my own. | SA 1 | A 2 | D 3 | SD 4 |

Appendix B
Demographics

Appendix C
Sport Fandom Questionnaire

Appendix D

Modified Sport Spectator Identification Scale (SSIS)

SSIS

Directions: Answer the following questions based on how you feel about the Dare Devils. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, simply be honest in your responses. (circle your answer)

1. How important to YOU is it that this team wins?

Not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very important

2. How strongly do YOU see YOURSELF as a fan of this team?

Not at all a fan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very much a fan

3. If this game was aired for viewing, how closely would you follow the game via ANY of the following: a) in person or on television, b) on the radio, c) television news or a newspaper, and/or d) the Internet?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 View the whole game

SSIS

Directions: Answer the following questions based on how you feel about the Black Knights. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, simply be honest in your responses. (circle your answer)

1. How important to YOU is it that this team wins?

Not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very important

2. How strongly do YOU see YOURSELF as a fan of this team?

Not at all a fan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very much a fan

3. If this game was aired for viewing, how closely would you follow the game via ANY of the following: a) in person or on television, b) on the radio, c) television news or a newspaper, and/or d) the Internet?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 View the whole game

Appendix E
Gambling Protocol

Listed below are five football games. Assume that you have \$100 to spend, and you are able to place wagers on the football game or games. You may spend all of your \$100, or only part of it. In addition, you may bet on only one football game, or all five of them if you choose; however, you may only place your wager on one football team per game. In other words, do not wager money on both teams that are playing each other. Notice that after the first team in each game, there is a + or – and then a number. In gambling, this is referred to as the “line.” The number is the amount of points that a team is expected to win or lose by. For example, in game 1, there is a (-1) after the Rockets. This means that the Rockets are expected to win by 1 point. Also for example, in game 2, there is a (+3) after the Ninjas. This means that the Ninjas are expected to lose by 3 points. You will circle the team or teams that you believe will win the game. In the space provided next to the teams, write down the amount of money that you are wagering for that game.

- Game 1 The Rockets (-1) vs. The Spaceships _____
Game 2 The Ninjas (+3) vs. The Zombies _____
Game 3 The Dare Devils (-24) vs. The Black Knights _____
Game 4 The Hulks (-2) vs. The Wolves _____
Game 5 The River Rats (+1) vs. The Bull Dogs _____

Appendix F
Informed Consent

Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in a survey research project. Before verbally giving your permission to participate we would like to explain the following.

1. Your participation is completely voluntary. This means you have the right to not answer any question you do not want to, or to quit at any time without any penalty.
2. For this study, you will be asked to gamble with pretend money, and if this poses a problem, you are able to dismiss yourself from participating in this study, without penalty.
3. For this study, you will remain completely anonymous. That is, you will not be asked to write down any identifying information, such as your name.
4. This study appears to have minimal risks and discomfort. However, there is always a chance that a question could cause discomfort or problems. Please let the researchers know if any questions are upsetting.
5. Benefits of this study include a sense of well being for contributing to scientific research, helping a WKU graduate student, and providing information that will be used to help better understand sport spectators.
6. During participation you will be asked to complete a section asking for about age, education, ethnicity, gender, and the football team you support. Also, you will be asked to complete three short measures (16 items, 5 items, 3 items) that evaluate team identification, sport fandom, and need for affiliation. These surveys collectively should take about 15 - 20 minutes to complete.
7. Although your individual responses will remain anonymous, your data will be combined with the data of others and may be submitted for publication in scholarly journals or presented at conventions.

Professor Rick Grieve, Ph.D., is the Faculty Sponsor for this research project and can be contacted at (270) 745-4417, with any questions in regards to the study, Monday through Friday from 9:00 am until 4:00 pm. Dr. Grieves' office is located in Tate Page Hall room 258. Questions or complaints about research participants' rights can be directed to the Human Subjects Review Board, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101, or by phone at (270)-745-4652.

Appendix G
Debriefing Statement

Thank you for taking part in this study. This study examines individuals' levels of identification with social groups including sport teams, religion, school groups, social groups, occupation, and a community-related activity. You first completed a questionnaire which provided us with basic information about yourself. Next, you completed a questionnaire used to measure your level of sport fandom. You also completed a questionnaire measuring your need for affiliation, or connection, with other people. You were then asked to remember and write down a memory that you had when you felt one of the following: that you belonged to a group, felt different from others in a group, or neither belonged nor felt different from others in a group. Then you were asked to wager money on a football game(s). Finally, you were asked to rate how identified you were with two of the football teams. The results of this study will be used to examine how the need for belongingness or distinctiveness influences team identification. I want to remind you that your responses in this study will remain anonymous. If you have any questions regarding your participation, you may contact the primary investigator, Courtney Clippert, at courtney.clippert270@wku.edu, or my supervising professor, Dr. Rick Grieve, at (270) 745-4417. Also, if you feel any discomfort from participating in this study, you may contact the Western Kentucky University Counseling and Testing Center at (270)-745-3195

Appendix H

Human Subjects Review Board Approval

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Human Subjects Review Board
Office of Sponsored Programs
301 Potter Hall
270-745-4652; Fax 270-745-4211
E-mail: Paul.Mooney@wku.edu

In future correspondence, please refer to HS10-052, September 24, 2009

Courtney Clippert
c/o Dr. Grieve
Psychology
WKU

Courtney Clippert:

Your revision to the research project, *Potential Factors that Influence Team Identification: A Desire to be Similar or Different*, was reviewed by the HSRB and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects' welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

1. In addition, the IRB found that you need to orient participants as follows: (1) signed informed consent is not required; (2) Provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data. (3) Appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects.

This project is therefore approved at the Expedited Review Level until September 24, 2010.

2. Please note that the institution is not responsible for any actions regarding this protocol before approval. If you expand the project at a later date to use other instruments please re-apply. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the above address. Please report any changes to this approved protocol to this office. A Continuing Review protocol will be sent to you in the future to determine the status of the project. Also, please use the stamped approval forms to assure participants of compliance with The Office of Human Research Protections regulations.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Mooney, M.S.T.M.
Compliance Coordinator
Office of Sponsored Programs
Western Kentucky University

cc: HS file number Clippert HS10-052

