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Introduction

• Recent proliferation of fantasy football due to Internet (32 million in 2011)  
  (FSTA, 2011; Eitzen & Sage, 2009; Drayer et al., 2010)

• Consumers’ perceptions and attitudes are always changing  
  (Drayer et al., 2010)
Review of Literature

• Traditional consumption not mitigated

(Karg & McDonald, 2010; Dwyer & Drayer, 2010)
Review of Literature

• Motivations –
  ▫ Entertainment/Escape & Competition
  ▫ Gambling

  (Dwyer & Kim, 2011)
Demographics

- Larger and ideal consumers:
  - $94,000 household income
  - College educated
  - Full-time employees

  (Fisher, 2008; FSTA, 2011)

- What about younger participants?
  - Parental attitudes

  (Hill & Beatty, 2010)
Research Objectives

- Investigate motivations of adolescent fantasy football participants
- Effect of their level of competitiveness
- Predict consumer behavior
Methods

- Survey (N=116) 
  (Dwyer & Kim, 2011)
- Agree (7) or disagree (1)
- Recruitment
  - Local schools
  - Snowball sample – social media
- PCA with Promax Rotation
Results

Motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sample Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition (5 items)</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction 1 (4 items)</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling (3 items)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Escape (4 items)</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction 2 (2 items)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Interaction:
1 – with friends & family
2 – with strangers & new people

Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM2</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM5</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM3</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM4</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT3</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAM2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAM6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.
Level of Competitiveness

- Recreational vs. very competitive or competitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPETITION</td>
<td>812.422</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>406.211</td>
<td>18.081</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>91.373</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.687</td>
<td>2.117</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMBLING</td>
<td>246.086</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>123.043</td>
<td>5.897</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERTAINMENT</td>
<td>174.713</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87.357</td>
<td>5.196</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL2</td>
<td>41.553</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.776</td>
<td>2.216</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

• Impact on social interaction
  (Dwyer & Kim, 2011; Farquhar & Meeds, 2007)

• Gambling motivation – not strong
  (Comeau, 2007)

• Complements traditional consumption
  (Drayer et al., 2010)
Limitations

• Voluntary sample

• Lack of participant background information
Future Research

• Adolescent consumer behavior
  ▫ Less financial control than adults

• Qualitative study
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Conclusions

- Adolescents motivated by:
  - Competition (factor mean = 4.78)
  - Interaction with friends and family (4.96)
  - Entertainment (5.89)

- Not motivated by:
  - Interaction with strangers (3.48)
  - Gambling (3.47)
    - Preference, but not motivation

- Opportunity to follow more NFL players