

9-2017

A New Player in the Game: Examining Differences in Motives and Consumption Between Traditional, Hybrid, and Daily Fantasy Sport Users

James Weiner

Old Dominion University, jweiner@odu.edu

Brendan Dwyer

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/hms_fac_pubs



Part of the [Leisure Studies Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Weiner, James and Dwyer, Brendan, "A New Player in the Game: Examining Differences in Motives and Consumption Between Traditional, Hybrid, and Daily Fantasy Sport Users" (2017). *Human Movement Sciences Faculty Publications*. 41.
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/hms_fac_pubs/41

Original Publication Citation

Weiner, J., & Dwyer, B. (2017). A new player in the game: Examining differences in motives and consumption between traditional, hybrid, and daily fantasy sport users. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 26(3), 140-152.

A New Player in the Game: Examining Differences in Motives and Consumption Between Traditional, Hybrid, and Daily Fantasy Sport Users

James Weiner and Brendan Dwyer

James Weiner is a lecturer at Old Dominion University and a doctoral student at the University of Louisville. His research interests include measuring the financial impact of service quality in sport and examining intersections of traditional business practices and college athletics departments.

Brendan Dwyer, PhD, is the director of research and distance learning in the Center for Sport Leadership at Virginia Commonwealth University. His research interests center around sport consumer behavior with a distinct focus on the media consumption habits of fantasy sport participants and behavioral patterns of ticket purchasers.

Abstract

Due in part to a \$200 million advertising campaign, daily fantasy sport (DFS) participation exploded in 2015. With faster payouts and unlimited lineup options, the activity has added to an already thriving fantasy sports industry. However, little is known about the distinct attitudes and behaviors that drive DFS participants. The current study examined 511 participants who played DFS-only, traditional, season-long fantasy football (TFS), and those who played both activities for motive and behavioral differences. Results indicated statistically significant motive scores differences across the groups as it relates to the factors of *gambling*, *social interaction*, and *competition* while *escape* and *entertainment* scores showed no difference. Media consumption differences were also found between the groups as those who played DFS in any form consumed more traditional broadcast and new media.

Keywords: daily fantasy sport, fantasy sport motivations, NFL, television consumption, gambling, football, professional sport

Introduction

If sports fans were not aware of what daily fantasy sports (DFS) consisted of in July of 2015, it would have been hard to miss during the football season that followed. DFS giants DraftKings and FanDuel purchased more than \$200 million in television advertisements that appeared on ESPN a staggering 13,000 times (Kludt, 2015). With nearly one million unique participants and revenues approaching \$3 billion, the DFS market is a booming industry despite less than five years of existence (Heitner, 2015).

In growing this user base, DFS providers have capitalized on the growing demand for fantasy sports, in general. Traditional, season-long fantasy sports (TFS) have been in existence for nearly 60 years and the activity currently accounts for nearly \$26 billion in

participant spending (Fantasy Sport Trade Association [FSTA], 2016). DFS has added to the industry by creating an innovative, engaging activity. New teams and leagues can be formed each day or week as opposed to once during the pre-season. In addition, money changes hands immediately following daily or weekly competition as opposed to once during the postseason. Despite the recent surge in participation, little is known of the antecedents of DFS participation.

Fantasy sport participants, in general, represent a white whale for sport leagues, corporate sponsors, and advertisers, as their average age, level of engagement, and purchasing power are highly sought after (Bowman, Spinda, Sanderson, & Anderson, 2016; Fisher, 2008). In addition, TFS participation has been found to be hugely important in driving media consumption for

teams and leagues (Nesbit & King 2010); is built upon social interaction, competition, and entertainment (Dwyer & Kim, 2011); and is mostly benign from a gambling perspective (Drayer, Dwyer, Shapiro, 2013; Dwyer & Kim, 2011).

In 2015, it was estimated that 58.2 million Americans participated in some form of fantasy sport (FSTA, 2016). On average, these individuals spent \$162 over the course of the year on costs related to TFS. Interestingly, the FTSA (2016) also noted that the average DFS participants spent nearly 63% more on game-related costs, at \$257. This drastic increase in spending may indicate additional consumer differences between those who play DFS and those who do not. With little known about the differences between DFS and TFS participation, the purpose of the current study was twofold: (1) to measure possible motivational and behavioral differences between those who only play TFS, those who only play DFS, and those who play both activities, and (2) to explore the motivational factors that impact media consumption among these three groups. To do so, the study was guided conceptually by uses and gratifications (U&G) theory.

Related Literature

Conceptual Framework: U&G Theory

Blumler and Katz (1974) developed modern U&G theory in an attempt to explain consumers' choices in mass media. The authors' efforts focused on the psychological perspective of how consumers choose their own media to fulfill their needs. U&G theory suggests that an individual actively selects media based on their environmental and psychological gratifications from that particular media. This theory has evolved greatly over the past 40 years. As interactivity, technology, and social networking has increased, so has the gratification opportunities for media consumers. As a result, a number of consumer motivations studies have utilized U&G theory as a framework. From magazine readership (Payne, Severn, & Dozier, 1988) to Twitter usage (Hamilton, Kaltcheva, & Rohm, 2016), U&G theory has served as a foundational framework for studying motives for a number of media services. This includes spectator sport media as well.

U&G theory posits that rather than being passive consumers of media, individuals choose media that meet their specific needs, such as to enhance knowledge, diversion, social interaction, escape, or entertainment (McQuail, 2010). Clavio and Frederick (2014) used U&G theory to study social media communication among sports fans. Sherry, Lucas, Greenberg, and Lachlan (2006) utilized the framework to examine

video game motives. Similarly, Weiss and Schiele (2013) explored motives for eSports participation.

As it relates to the current study, U&G theory has been tied to motives and behavioral outcomes since the 1960s. Blumler and McQuail's first attempt at testing the theory in 1969, as cited by West and Turner (2010), focused on individuals' motives for watching political programs on television. In addition, U&G theory has been utilized to guide and explain participation and consumption within online gaming (Wu, Wang, & Tsai, 2010). LaRose, Mastro, and Eastin (2001) applied the theory to explain positive and negative online behavior. It was also the guiding framework for the motivational scale used within the current study, the Motivational Scale for Fantasy Football Participation (MSFFP) developed by Dwyer and Kim (2011).

The three key tenets of the theory include: (1) to explain how individuals use media to gratify needs, (2) to discover underlying motives for individuals' media use, and (3) to identify the positive and the negative outcomes of individual media use (McQuail, 2001). The current study applied the last two tenets to the context of fantasy football. The emergence of DFS creates another unique research context for U&G application. Similar to TFS, the activity occurs entirely online; it is competitive, engaging, includes a social component, and is directly tied to professional sports broadcasts. This leads to the following questions: (1) are those who play DFS drawn to the same participatory aspects as those who only play TFS, and (2) how do these motives relate to media consumption of fantasy and professional sport content?

Previous research on fantasy sport motives and media consumption has primarily utilized U&G theory. For instance, the following scale development studies were guided by U&G theory: Farquhar and Meeds (2007), Dwyer and Kim (2011), and Spinda and Haridakis (2008). Motivation theory, social identity theory, and entertainment theory have also been used to explain how and why fantasy sports participant consume (Billings & Ruihley, 2013; Dwyer, Shapiro, & Drayer, 2013; Ruihley & Billings, 2013). However, given the theory's underpinning in motivational and behavioral outcomes, U&G theory was deemed to be the most applicable.

Fantasy Sport Motivation

Despite nearly 60 million participants (FSTA, 2016), fantasy sports consumers represent a unique population whose motives have only recently been a current topic of research. Motives, as explained by Jung (1978), are reasons that underlie a given behavior. By better understanding motives, researchers have been able to better understand and even in some cases explain

consumer sovereignty and decision-making (Harris & Reynolds, 2004). From a practical perspective, it is difficult for marketers and managers to impact or create customer motives, yet if better understood it could lead to the development of products and services to better meet the needs of all segments (Hanna & Wozniak, 2012). As a result, marketing researchers have explored the motives of fantasy sport participants over the past decade.

Farquhar and Meeds (2007) investigated typologies of fantasy sport participants, noting the five primary motives as: surveillance, arousal, entertainment, escape, and social interaction. As previously mentioned, Dwyer and Kim's (2011) work developed the first fantasy sport motivation scale, the MSFFP. This research initially explored four motives: gambling, social interaction, competition, and entertainment/escape. Initially, the motivational factor of gambling did not predict sport-related consumption. However, Dwyer and Kim suggested researchers could further segment the market by targeting individuals stimulated by economic return. Despite the call from Dwyer and Kim to further investigate gambling motives in fantasy sport participants, little additional research has been conducted in this area.

Previous researchers have segmented fantasy sport motives based on traditional demographics, including gender and game involvement. Dwyer et al. (2013) investigated motivational differences among fantasy sport participants who played fantasy baseball, noting that there were distinct segments within groups of participants, highlighting that consumption intentions differed between segments. Ruihley and Billings (2013) investigated motivation differences between male and female participants. They noted little significant differences in the majority of their motivational scale items, with only *enjoyment* and *pass time* showing statistical significance. The remaining seven motivational factors were nearly identical between genders. Goldsmith and Walker (2015) conducted a comprehensive mixed-methods study, which examined fantasy sport participation on "non-fans" motivation differences to attend NASCAR races before and after participating in a fantasy NASCAR league. However, the focus of the study revolved around motivation to attend a physical event and whether the fantasy league influenced attendance likelihood, and not the actual motivations of fantasy participation itself. Regardless, the researchers found a significant difference in attitude and patronage intentions

Billings, Ruihley, and Yang (2016) marked the first study devoted to DFS. Their purpose was to shed light on the differences in the psychological perspective of gambling among DFS participants compared to TFS

participants. Motivation and consumption differences were also measured among DFS and TFS, as well as relationships between the amount of money invested and its correlation with multiple variables. No statistically significant motive or overall media consumption differences were found. However, there was a statistically significant difference in overall fantasy sport perception of it being a game of skill vs. chance, as DFS participants felt more strongly overall fantasy participation was a game of skill. The current study varies in that it measures not only TFS-only and hybrid players, but it includes a new third group, DFS-only participants.

In all, there has been substantial research on fantasy sports motives since 2007. However, previous research has focused almost exclusively on traditional fantasy sport users, and it is possible that the unique wants and needs of DFS and hybrid players are different from TFS. As previously mentioned, U&G theory has even been used to explain needs associated with fantasy sport participation (Dwyer & Kim, 2011). Thus, it is possible that participants are drawn to different gratifications associated with the activities, and the unknown motivations of DFS users provided the first research question of the study:

RQ1: What motivational differences exist between TFS-only participants, DFS-only participants, and those who play both activities?

Fantasy Sports and Media Consumption

Media rights accounted for nearly \$15 billion in revenue for North American sports in 2014, and in 2018, media rights are expected to eclipse gate revenue as the largest contributor to overall revenue (Broughton, 2015). In addition, in 2014–15, sports accounted for 37% of the total advertising revenue of the "Big Four" networks: ABC, CBS, NBC, and Fox (Crupi, 2015). From a team and league perspective, media-dominant sports fans were shown to be "more likely to purchase team-related merchandise, view media advertising and promotions, and are as involved with the sport as the 'heavy' consumer" (Pritchard & Funk, 2006, p. 316). Fantasy sport participants are the embodiment of media dominant sport fans.

The data surrounding the consumption patterns of fantasy sport users are impressive. In 2010, ESPN Integrated Media Research found that traditional fantasy sport participants consume almost three times the amount of ESPN media when compared to individuals who do not participate in fantasy sport. Indeed, the academic community has confirmed this phenomenon, as Drayer, Shapiro, Dwyer, Morse, and White (2010)

found fantasy football led to more time online and more time communicating with friends, family, and co-workers. Additionally, a “new NFL experience was discovered” (p. 137), as the perceptions of one fantasy team compiled with players of multiple NFL teams. For example, one fantasy sport participant consuming media on their fantasy team may be motivated to watch significantly more televised games or sport content as they may follow “their” 12 players (who play for many different teams) throughout the week.

Quantitative studies paralleled Drayer et al.’s (2010) qualitative findings, as multiple studies have noted TFS participation serves as a complement to traditional fandom in increasing television consumption (Dwyer, 2011; Nesbit & King, 2010). Additionally, Dwyer (2011) found fantasy sport participation predicted increased consumption levels from fans watching not only the team of their best fantasy player, but also the team of their fantasy opponent’s best player, their personal favorite team, their personal rivalry team, and even neutral matchups. This trend continued internationally when Karg and McDonald (2011) conducted a study on fantasy sport participants in the Australian Football League, finding fantasy sport participants were much heavier consumers of televised games that did not involve the team that they support, though this is hardly surprising. Additional findings in the same study involved the fact that fantasy sport players were more engaged with their sport, spent more money, and had stronger points of attachment to the sport, without sacrificing the loyalty of their preferred team.

As it relates to the current study, two forms of media consumption were examined: traditional broadcast media and new media. Traditional broadcast media represents the mass media outlets and included NFL games on major networks (television and/or radio) and other nongame programming such as network shows like ESPN’s SportsCenter and the NFL Network’s Redzone Channel. New media involved social media engagement, such as Twitter and Facebook, Internet articles on strategy or player rankings, and podcasts. The difference between the two forms of behavior is important within the current context, as new media consumption requires a higher level of commitment and effort than traditional broadcast consumption. Thus, individuals motivated by different factors and at varying levels may indeed consume the two forms of media differently.

Taken together, the introduction of DFS within the sport consumer lexicon has resulted in a seismic shift in participation that directly impacts the fantasy sports industry, media providers, and ultimately, professional sport teams and leagues (Heitner, 2015). As suggested by U&G theory, one consumes media to meet unique

needs and wants, and previous research indicates TFS participants consume more mediated sport content than nonparticipating sports fans. However similar to motivation research, the only information regarding the consumption habits of DFS-only participants comes from popular press, and no academic studies have been conducted around the topic. Therefore, the final four research questions were developed to examine consumption differences between those who only play TFS, those who only play DFS, and those who participate in both.

RQ2: What media consumption differences exist between those who only play TFS, only play DFS, and those who play both?

RQ3: Which of the MSFFP factors of those who only play TFS significantly impact their media consumption of NFL?

RQ4: Which of the MSFFP factors of those who play only DFS significantly impact their media consumption of NFL?

RQ5: Which of the MSFFP factors of those who play both forms of fantasy football significantly impact their media consumption of NFL?

Method

Participants and Procedures

This study targeted TFS participants and DFS participants. Recent industry research, as cited by Gouker (2015), has concluded that only a small percentage of TFS participants are playing DFS, but most of DFS participants (83%) are playing season-long contests. However, the current study’s DFS-playing sample was comprised of nearly 25% DFS-only participants. The respondents were grouped into the following three segments: TFS participants with no DFS experience (TFS-only), DFS participants who do not play TFS (DFS-only), and a hybrid group that play both forms of fantasy football (hybrid). It is important to note that despite playing both activities, only DFS-related motives were assessed for the hybrid subgroup. This decision was made for two reasons: (1) the need for understanding DFS motives, specifically of this larger segment of the population (Gouker, 2015), and (2) the amount of TFS motive information already available in the literature.

Fantasy football was selected as the activity under investigation, and data were collected over a five-week period in November 2015. A sample was solicited via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) asking for

fantasy football participants in any form. Potential respondents were offered \$.25 (USD) for a completed survey. Fantasy sports participation is ubiquitous. With nearly 60 million participants in the US and Canada (FSTA, 2016), it is now estimated that one in every nine individuals in these two countries plays fantasy sports in some form or fashion. In addition, fantasy participation occurs almost entirely online. The portals through which participants manage and interact with their teams is online, information about fantasy players and game tactics are online, as is the communication between and within leagues. Thus, taken together, an online solicitation through MTurk was deemed acceptable to reach a generalizable sample. However, screening questions were added to ensure basic knowledge of fantasy football, and IP addresses were tracked to prevent ballot stuffing. In addition, the data were analyzed post hoc to eliminate respondents that provided pattern responses. The survey questionnaire was hosted by FormSite.com.

Since data were collected later in the season (weeks 8–12 of both the NFL and fantasy seasons), an effort was made to ensure that all participants had similar levels of interest in fantasy football over this time period. Given the formation of weekly lineups in DFS participation, it was assumed that the DFS-only and hybrid participants had higher levels of interest during the weeks under investigation. The TFS-only participants, however, faced a different challenge. In a multi-stage study of fantasy participants over the course of one NFL season, Dwyer (2013) found that as one's TFS team is eliminated from league contention, interest and, more importantly, consumption behavior related to fantasy football dwindled. To account for this potential issue with the TFS-only subgroup, two manipulations tests were conducted. First, all TFS-only participants were asked the likelihood that their favorite fantasy team would win the upcoming weekend. This item was measured on a 7-point Likert type scale from "highly unlikely" to "highly likely." Individuals who scored a 1 ("highly unlikely") or 2 ("unlikely") were eliminated from the sample.

Second, all participants were provided the Attraction to Fantasy Players scale developed by Dwyer (2013). This scale was created based on suggestions from Drayer et al. (2010) and was designed to match Funk and James' (2006) second level of their Psychological Continuum Model. The items are available within the Appendix. Dwyer (2013) found that TFS participants whose team failed during the regular season were statistically significantly less attracted to their fantasy players. Thus, to test if the current groups under examination had similar interest in their fantasy players at this crucial cross-section within the season, a one-way

ANOVA was conducted to see if attraction scores differed between the groups.

Instrument

The initial survey question asked respondents if they had ever played daily fantasy football. Based on this response, respondents were provided either DFS- or TFS-related questions. For instance, to measure motives, Dwyer and Kim's (2011) five-factor, 17-item MSFFP was utilized (see Appendix for items). This instrument was developed for season-long fantasy football, but for this study, it was also adapted to daily fantasy football for the DFS-only and hybrid subgroups. While a three-factor model was developed in 2011 (*social interaction*, *escape/entertainment*, and *competition*), Dwyer et al. (2013) utilized all 17 items, including the *gambling* factor, to examine fantasy baseball participants. The reliability and validity scores all met the appropriate criteria, and it was even recommended to split the *entertainment* and *escape* factors. In total, a five-factor scale was used to examine differences in fantasy baseball consumption, and the current study employed the same scale. The only difference in application between groups was that "fantasy football" was replaced with "daily fantasy football" for both the DFS-only and hybrid subgroups. The collection portal containing the "daily" instrument remained open until a desired number of participants had been reached, to ensure satisfactory sample sizes for both surveys.

Broadcast media consumption and new media consumption were also collected in the form of hours of media consumption per week. Each question was based on fantasy football specific consumption of the NFL, but broadcast media included televised and radio programming while new media included social media (Twitter and Facebook), podcasts, and Internet-based programming.

Analyses

Prior to addressing RQ1, three analyses were conducted. First, TFS-only respondents who scored less than 3 on the 7-point likelihood to win item were eliminated. Second, three Satorra-Bentler maximum likelihood of estimation method confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted in Mplus to confirm the factor structures of the MSFFP for both samples (DFS and TFS). Prior to running the CFA, key assumptions were tested as prescribed by Brown (2012). Composite reliability scores for each factor were examined to measure the scale's internal consistency, and the average variance extracted (AVE) score for each factor was assessed to examine convergent validity. Third, a one-way ANOVA with a follow-up Tukey post hoc test was performed to test attraction to fantasy players difference between the groups.

A one-way MANOVA with a follow-up Tamhane's post hoc was then conducted to answer RQ1 and RQ2. The dependent variables for the MANOVA included the mean scores for the five MSFFP factors and both forms of media consumption. The independent variable was group membership (DFS-only, TFS-only, or hybrid). Three multiple linear regressions were then conducted to answer RQ3, RQ4, and RQ5. A separate regression was run on each subgroup. The outcome variable was the aggregate media consumption score (broadcast and new) and the predictor variables were the mean MSFFP factor scores.

Results

Five hundred ninety-six fantasy football participants began the survey questionnaire with 546 completing

it. Respondents who did not complete the entire survey questionnaire or provided patterned responses were removed from the sample. Two hundred fifty-five indicated playing DFS (48%) and were provided the DFS-specific MSFFP items. The remaining 280 participants were provided the original TFS-related MSFFP items. Twenty-five TFS-only participants were removed from the sample post hoc as they indicated little or no chance of winning the upcoming NFL weekend. Given that only 24.4% of the DFS playing sample played DFS-only, a random sample of 90 respondents were selected from the larger hybrid ($N=193$) and TFS-only ($N=255$) sub-samples to answer RQ1 and RQ2. This procedure was conducted to ensure somewhat equal cell sizes for the group contrasts. For research questions three through five, all qualifying participants ($N=510$)

TABLE 1. Sample Demographics

	ALL <i>N</i> =510	DFS-only <i>N</i> =62	Hybrid <i>N</i> =193 (<i>N</i> =90)	TFS-only <i>N</i> =255 (<i>N</i> =90)
Age				
Mean	34	37	(33)	34 (34)
St. Deviation	10.18	9.60	(10.04)	9.66 (10.39)
Gender				
Male	68%	74%	(69%)	69% (65%)
Education				
High School or below	31%	37%	29% (24%)	28% (34%)
Associates	10%	6%	10% (10%)	11% (9%)
Bachelors	41%	42%	39% (32%)	40% (45%)
Masters and above	17%	16%	22% (34%)	18% (12%)
Participation				
Traditional leagues/year	2.47	--	2.45 (2.61)	2.61 (2.48)
Daily leagues/week	3.31	3.58	3.11 (3.02)	--
Income				
Less than \$50,000	47%	46%	48% (35%)	44% (46%)
\$50,000 to \$99,999	39%	39%	38% (41%)	40% (42%)
\$100,000 to 149,999	9%	14%	7% (14%)	9% (9%)
\$150,000 or more	5%	4%	7% (10%)	7% (3%)
Ethnicity				
Asian/Pacific Islander	13%	22%	9% (22%)	19% (15%)
Black/African American	8%	9%	6% (6%)	8% (2%)
Caucasian	71%	62%	77% (66%)	68% (74%)
Hispanic	3%	0%	3% (2%)	3% (4%)
Multiracial	4%	8%	1% (3%)	4% (2%)
Would rather not say	4%	0%	4% (1%)	4% (4%)

from the sample were utilized. The sample and subgroup specifics are available in Table 1.

Three CFAs were conducted to test the factor structure of the MSFFP for each subgroup. The CFA factor loading results are available in Table 2. The following fit indices and their cut-off criteria were used to assess the

overall fit of the model: the Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square statistic (χ^2), the comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker Lewis index (TLI), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). The χ^2 values for each model were not statistically significant at $p < .050$ ($df = 109$), and the $\chi^2/\text{degrees of freedom}$ ratios were

TABLE 2. Factor Loadings for the Confirmatory Factor Analyses of the MSFFP

Factor (Item)	DFS Participants	Hybrid Participants	TFS Participants
Social Interaction			
SOC1	.892	.802	.872
SOC2	.811	.849	.746
SOC3	.802	.812	.869
SOC4	.710	.801	.746
Competition			
COM1	.711	.781	.726
COM2	.719	.741	.811
COM3	.678	.623	.667
COM4	.803	.791	.789
Entertainment			
ENT1	.801	.760	.729
ENT2	.766	.769	.801
ENT3	.812	.731	.811
Escape			
ESC1	.899	.927	.909
ESC2	.692	.674	.801
Gambling			
GAM1	.812	.671	.736
GAM2	.789	.717	.761
GAM3	.866	.809	.841
GAM4	.858	.811	.812

TABLE 3. Overall and Comparative Fit Indices for each CFA Model

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	RMSEA	CFI	TLI
DFS-only	123.281 (109)	1.131	.059	.940	.937
Hybrid	128.915 (109)	1.183	.063	.957	.931
TFS-only	119.455 (109)	1.096	.051	.961	.929

each greater than one. See Table 3 for the overall and comparative indices scores.

A variety of other comparative indices were analyzed in order to further assess the component fit of the data. The values for RMSEA, CFI, and TLI all reflect adequate to good fit to the data (Bentler, 1990). Overall, the fit indices for each model fell within the acceptable range of values suggested by Hu and Bentler (1999). Thus, the five-factor, 17-item model was structurally confirmed for each subgroup. For measurement purposes, it is important to note that the escape factor

loaded properly and the scale scores indicated sufficient reliability. Thus, Dwyer et al.'s (2013) suggestion to separate entertainment and escape was confirmed with the current study's samples. Table 4 provides reliability and convergent validity scores for this phase of the study; Table 5 provides the correlation scores for each factor by subgroup. Only one reliability score was slightly below the cut-off criteria suggested by Nunnally (1978) for widely used scales. Other than that, the scale's internal consistency was deemed adequate. With

TABLE 4. Reliability and Validity Results

Factors	Composite Reliability			Average Variance Extracted		
	DFS	Hybrid	TFS	DFS	Hybrid	TFS
1. Social Interaction	.894	.821	.819	.650	.666	.657
2. Competition	.816	.833	.822	.532	.543	.563
3. Entertainment	.801	.812	.813	.692	.569	.622
4. Escape	.766	.802	.801	.644	.657	.734
5. Gambling	.869	.855	.864	.692	.568	.610

TABLE 5. Correlation Matrices

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Social Interaction	--	.554	.374	.305	.019	--				
2. Competition	.471	--	.483	.386	.263	.618	--			
3. Entertainment	.531	.582	--	.407	.102	.218	.227	--		
4. Escape	.221	.401	.561	--	.519	.189	.186	.162	--	
5. Gambling	.033	.298	.081	.160	--	.045	.127	.229	.090	--

Note. The top portion of the correlation matrix (shaded) includes the hybrid subgroup factor correlation scores. The bottom left portion includes the DFS-only subgroup factor correlation scores, and the bottom right portion represents the TFS-only subgroup factor correlation scores.

regard to convergent validity, each factor reached the .50 criterion established by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

The manipulation test results indicated that the three groups were somewhat similar as it related to their attraction to their fantasy players. First, the Cronbach's alpha scores for the Attraction to Fantasy Players scale were .811, .876, and .854, respectively, for the DFS-only, hybrid, and TFS-only subgroups. Thus, the scale scores were deemed reliable. Second, the one-way ANOVA results indicated that the differences between the three groups were nominal. See Table 6 for the ANOVA results.

Research Questions 1 and 2

A MANOVA was conducted to answer RQ1 and RQ2 (see Table 6). RQ1 aimed to explore the MSFFP factor differences between the three subgroups. Each factor was measured on a 7-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7), and the Pillai's Trace *F* statistic was significant at 2.874 ($p < .001$), indicating motivational differences across the subgroups. A Tamhane's post hoc was interpreted to see which groups differed on which factor. In particular, both the DFS-only and hybrid group scored statistically

significantly higher on the *gambling* factor than the TFS-only group. The TFS-only group scored statistically significantly higher on the *social interaction* factor than both groups that played DFS. Moreover, the hybrid and TFS-only groups scored statistically significantly higher than the DFS-only group on the *competition* factor. Lastly, the *entertainment* and *escape*

factor scores were relatively similar between the groups and no statistically significant differences resulted. As for the media consumption results (RQ2), statistically significant differences resulted between the groups, as those who played DFS (hybrid and DFS-only) appear to consume more broadcast and new media than TFS-only participants.

TABLE 6. MANOVA Results: Research Questions 1 & 2

Dependent Variables	Mean			F	p
	DFS	HYBRID	TFS		
Attraction to Fantasy Players (manipulation)	5.31	5.50	5.59	1.23	.178
Social Interaction**	3.95c	4.01c	4.79ab	6.33	.002
Competition*	4.13bc	5.05a	4.97a	2.69	.043
Entertainment	5.42	5.49	5.43	.874	.265
Escape	5.04	5.01	4.81	.949	.389
Gambling***	5.01c	4.83c	3.31ab	24.78	< .001
Broadcast Media Consumption (hrs/week)**	4.96c	5.84c	3.46ab	5.73	.004
New Media Consumption (hrs/week)***	3.94c	4.56c	2.36ab	11.06	< .001

Tamhane's Post Hoc Test: a Statistically significant difference than the DFS-only subgroup, b statistically significant difference than the hybrid subgroup, and c Statistically significant difference from the TFS-only subgroup.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Note. MSFFP items measured using a 7-point Likert scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree"

Research Questions 3, 4, and 5

Three separate multiple linear regressions were conducted to answer the last three research questions. The first regression included DFS-only participants, and resulted in a statistically significant model ($F[5, 57] = 1.932$, $p = .048$, $R^2 = .119$) where the *entertainment*, *escape*, and *gambling* factors positively correlated with increased media consumption (see Table 7). The second model included the larger subgroup of hybrid

participants and was also statistically significant ($F[5, 188] = 3.987$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .378$), yet this time the *social interaction* and *gambling* factors positively impacted media consumption. Lastly, the third model included the larger subgroup of TFS-only participants and was statistically significant ($F[5, 255] = 4.112$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .299$). In this model, social interaction, competition, and gambling positively impacted media consumption.

TABLE 7. Multiple Linear Regression Results: Research Questions 3, 4, & 5

DFS-only			Hybrid			TFS-only		
Variables	β	p	Variables	β	p	Variables	β	p
Social Interaction	.056	.611	Social Interaction*	.432	.012	Social Interaction**	.199	.008
Competition	.071	.789	Competition	.051	.849	Competition**	.200	.006
Entertainment*	.189	.031	Entertainment	.031	.714	Entertainment	.036	.790
Escape*	.167	.042	Escape	.226	.202	Escape	.118	.285
Gambling***	.399	<.001	Gambling**	.213	.005	Gambling*	.205	.030

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Note: Beta (β) score is standardized.

Discussion

With the rise of DFS participation, the fantasy sport umbrella has evolved into multiple variants of the same activity, occurring on vastly different platforms. The purpose of this study was to explore motivational and behavioral differences between fantasy participants who only play DFS, those who only play TFS, and those who play both. The results suggest that the participant groups under examination (DFS-only, TFS-only, and hybrid) are driven by different motives, yet the DFS-only and hybrid participants appear to be an advanced version of TFS participants from a media consumption perspective. These findings mark the first academic study that independently examines DFS-only participants, and provide initial insight into their motivational and behavioral habits. Contributions of this study confirm DFS-only as a distinct segment of fantasy football participants and provide a foundation for future research into the rapidly growing DFS market of consumers. Important results were uncovered through motive differences and motive similarities, and each group had distinct motives that positively affected weekly media consumption. The results related to each research question including implications, limitations, and future research ideas are discussed in greater detail in the following sections.

Motive Differences

Both the hybrid and DFS-only participants scored significantly higher on the gambling factor. Considering the enhanced gameplay features where teams and competitions are formed multiple times per day and the fact money changes hands immediately following the competition, it should not come as a surprise that DFS participants are more strongly motivated to make money. This result is potentially important for policymakers, as the tie between DFS and gambling is being hotly debated. The \$200 million DFS advertising blitz in 2015 included content that appeared to heavily promote economic returns, sparking criticism regarding the legality of DFS under gambling law (Ehrman, 2015; Tadman, 2012). Gambling and gaming is a delicate topic among sport marketers and advertisers; therefore, it is important to examine the motivations of participants to determine not only the letter-of-the-law legality, but also the intent of the participants themselves. The results of such an analysis, however, may be interpreted several ways. Indeed, financial gain showed the greatest mean difference between groups, indicating DFS players are much more motivated by their potential winnings. However, the *gambling* mean within the DFS and hybrid groups was not significantly different from some other variables. This may suggest that gambling is no more or less of a motivational

factor than *entertainment* or *escape* for DFS-only, and additionally no more or less of a motive than *competition* for hybrid.

Additionally, both hybrid and TFS-only groups scored significantly higher on the *competition* motive when compared to DFS-only. This contradicts existing literature that has found that chance for monetary reward increases the drive to compete (Nieuwenhuis, Aston-Jones, & Cohen, 2005). Similarly, Neighbors, Lostutter, Crounce, and Larimer (2002) found that college students were drawn equally to the competition of gambling as well as the opportunity for monetary reward. However, the *competition* items utilized for the current study (see Appendix) were developed as almost bragging rights items, as the focus for some were on direct competition with fellow competitors, possibly affected by the anonymous nature of DFS. This anonymity effect may also have played into the *social interaction* scores, which were statistically significantly higher for the TFS-only groups compared to either the hybrid or DFS-only participants. Effects from lack of a communication platform to increase social interaction or competition among DFS competitors would certainly warrant additional future research.

Motive Similarities

No significant differences were found within the motives of *entertainment* or *escape*, and the entertainment score remained the highest mean among all three groups. For DFS and hybrid constituents, this is somewhat remarkable given that most participants reportedly lose money (Stradbroke, 2015). Thus, regardless of financial loss, the activity is still highly entertaining. This is an important finding for DFS providers and potential partners. Similarly, TFS remains a highly entertaining activity for its participants. This is consistent with previous research on motives and outcomes of the activity (Billings & Ruohley, 2013; Dwyer, 2013; Dwyer & Kim, 2011).

Media Consumption

The results showed that the DFS-only and hybrid participants reported much higher consumption of sport media, both through traditional broadcast (TV, radio) as well as social media and Internet consumption when compared to the TFS-only subgroup. Previous research has shown traditional fantasy participants consume more media than non-participants (Drayer et al., 2010); therefore, such a significant increase between TFS and DFS subgroups may suggest once again that these participants are both advanced forms of TFS participants and ultimately ultra-media dominant fans. While on the surface it is logical that the daily participants would consume more than season-long participants, the time period of consumption was the same; one week.

As most daily football competitions are technically one-week competitions, the frame of measurement was not skewed in DFS's favor. TFS competition also occurs on a weekly basis, and participants manage a similar number of DFS and TFS teams each week. As a result, the significant difference between the groups is noteworthy, especially when you consider the consumption habits of TFS participants.

Theoretically, the U&G perspective suggests that media consumption is a direct result of a need or gratification. Thus, DFS appears to be an outlet for TFS looking for enhanced fantasy sport participation for the hybrid subgroup. It will be interesting to see if the participation growth is sustainable and more TFS participants will add DFS to their weekly fantasy sport inventory. As for the DFS-only subgroup, the motives that positively impacted media were more diversionary and entertainment-based than the hybrid group, which could support the hedonic outcomes of gambling. Further research is certainly warranted on this population of fantasy sport participants. From a practical perspective, Fisher (2008) reported on data showing traditional fantasy sport participants were "voracious consumers, strongly outpacing the general population in many leading product categories" (para. 1). Fantasy sport participants were more likely to have purchased beer within the last 30 days, read a sports magazine, own athletic shoes, or have a video game system in their house, among other valuable consumer behavior. This study suggests that such desirable traits may be amplified even further within the new, yet already massive group of DFS consumers. Lastly, this study supports findings in the literature regarding early adoption and innovation, as Taylor (1977) found that early adopters/innovators of a

product often tend to be heavy users. Further predictions may be suggested based off of this trend.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study was not without limitations. First, it was a cross-section of TFS and DFS participants. While the sample appears to be generalizable, it is only a snapshot of attitudes and behaviors. In addition, it was a snapshot near the end of the season, and while steps were taken to ensure a similar level of interest at this point in time, an investigation that started in preseason or in September would have been ideal. A longitudinal approach similar to Dwyer (2013) would certainly yield interesting results. Second, a comparison to nonparticipating NFL fans could provide a clear baseline for comparison. While differences were found between fantasy sports participants, differences between other types of fans would be beneficial for sport marketers and managers. Third, additional motives may be at play. The use of Dwyer and Kim's (2011) instrument may only tell part of the story. A scale development specifically for DFS participation may lead to unique motives not examined in the current study. Other forms of future research include, but are not limited to, an exploration of potential problem gambling behavior among DFS participants, the impact of DFS participation on favorite NFL team fandom, an investigation into factors influencing the *escape* motive in DFS-only participants, any effects on the lack of a communication platform for DFS competitors, a better understanding of the skill and chance components of DFS participation, and further early adoption and innovation trend predictions yet to occur based off of Taylor's (1977) theory.

APPENDIX A. Motivational Scale for Fantasy Football Participation (adapted from Dwyer & Kim, 2011)

<i>Social Interaction</i>	
1	Playing [daily] fantasy football provides an excellent opportunity to get together with, or stay in contact with, my family and friends.
2	One of the main reasons I play [daily] fantasy football is that doing so allows me to belong to a group of my peers.
3	An important reason for playing [daily] fantasy football is the ability it gives me to interact with my co-workers, friends, family, and/or significant other.
4	Interacting with other [daily] fantasy football participants is important to me.
<i>Gambling</i>	
5	The amount of money wagered determines how much I follow [daily] fantasy football team.
6	To me, [daily] fantasy football is just another way to bet on professional football.
7	I play [daily] fantasy football to win money.
8	Given the opportunity, I would prefer to wager money on [daily] fantasy football than play at no cost.

<i>Competition</i>	
9	I like to play [daily] fantasy football to prove to my fellow competitors that I am the best.
10	When playing [daily] fantasy football, it is important to me to compare my skills with my competitors.
11	It is important to me to win my [daily] fantasy football league(s).
12	An important reason for playing [daily] fantasy football is the opportunity it provides to compare my unique knowledge about NFL players and teams with my competitors.
<i>Entertainment</i>	
13	I play [daily] fantasy football because it makes watching NFL football more enjoyable.
14	Playing [daily] fantasy football has provided an excellent opportunity to enjoy the performance of NFL players who are not on my favorite NFL team(s).
15	I play [daily] fantasy football because it is a fun way to spend my time.
<i>Escape</i>	
16	Playing [daily] fantasy football provides an entertaining escape from my day-to-day activities.
17	I play [daily] fantasy football because it provides an entertaining escape from my day-to-day activities.

Note. Measured on a 7-point Likert type scale (“Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”)

APPENDIX B. Attraction to Fantasy Football Players Scale (Dwyer, 2013)

<i>Attraction to Fantasy Football Players</i>	
1	Following my fantasy football players is a pleasurable experience.
2	My fantasy football players interest me.
3	The performance of my fantasy football players is important to me.

Note. Measured on a 7-point Likert type scale (“Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”)

References

- Bentler, P. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238–246.
- Billings, A. C., & Ruihley, B. J. (2013). Why we watch, why we play: The relationship between fantasy sport and fanship motivations. *Mass Communication and Society*, 16, 5–25.
- Billings, A. C., Ruihley, B. J., Yang, Y. (2016). Fantasy gaming on steroids? Contrasting fantasy sport participation by daily fantasy sport participation. *Communication & Sport*. doi: 10.1177/2167479516644445
- Blumler J. G., & Katz, E. (1974). *The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bowman, N. D., Spinda, J. S. W., Sanderson, J., & Anderson, S. M. (2016). Projecting the next round: Scouting the future of fantasy sports. In N. D. Bowman, J. S. W. Spinda, & J. Sanderson's (Eds.), *Fantasy sports and the changing sports media industry: Media, players, and society* (pp. 287–300). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Broughton, D. (2015, October 19). Media rights to trump ticket sales by 2018. *Sports Business Daily*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2015/10/19/Research-and-Ratings/PwC.aspx>
- Brown, T. A. (2012). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Clavio, G., & Frederick, E. (2014). Sharing is caring: An exploration of motivations for social sharing and locational social media usage among sport fans. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 6, 70–85.
- Crupi, A. (2015, September 10). Sports now account for 37% of broadcast TV ad spending. *Advertising Age*. Retrieved from <http://adage.com/article/media/sports-account-37-percent-all-tv-ad-dollars/300310/>
- Drayer, J., Dwyer, B., & Shapiro, S. L. (2013). Examining the impact of league entry fees on online fantasy sport participation and league consumption. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 13, 339–357.
- Drayer, J., Shapiro, S. L., Dwyer, B., Morse, A. L., & White, J. (2010). The effects of fantasy football participation on NFL consumption: A qualitative analysis. *Sport Management Review*, 13, 129–141.
- Dwyer, B. (2011). The impact of attitudes and fantasy football involvement on intentions to watch NFL teams on television. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 4, 375–396.
- Dwyer, B. (2013). The impact of game outcomes on fantasy football participation and National Football League media consumption. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 22, 33–47.
- Dwyer, B., & Kim, Y. (2011). For love or money: Developing and validating a motivational scale for fantasy football participation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25, 70–83.

- Dwyer, B., Shapiro, S.L., & Drayer, J. (2013). Segmenting motivation: An analysis of fantasy baseball motives and mediated sport consumption. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 20, 129–137.
- Ehrman, N. J. (2015). Out of bounds: A legal analysis of pay-to-play daily fantasy sports. *The Sports Lawyer Journal*, 22, 79–114.
- ESPN Integrated Media Research Report. (2010). *ESPN top ten list for sport research*. In Broadcast Education Association Research Symposium, Las Vegas, NV.
- Fantasy Sports Trade Association. (2016). *Industry demographics: Actionable insights and insightful data*. Retrieved from <http://fsta.org/research/industry-demographics/>
- Farquhar, L. K., & Meeds, R. (2007). Types of fantasy sports users and their motivations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, 1208–1228.
- Fisher, E., (2008, November 17). Study: Fantasy players spend big. Street & Smith's *SportsBusiness Journal*, 11(29), 1–2. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsbusinessjournal.com/article/60598>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 382–388.
- Funk, D. C., & James, J. D. (2006). Consumer loyalty: The meaning of attachment in the development of sport team allegiance. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 189–208.
- Goldsmith, A. L., & Walker, M. (2015). The NASCAR experience: Examining the influence of fantasy sport participation on 'non-fans.' *Sport Management Review*, 18, 231–243.
- Gouker, D. (2015, January 20). FanDuel studies: Season-long and daily fantasy sports players exhibit key differences. *Legal Sports Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.legalsportsreport.com/370/fanduel-seasonlong-and-daily-fantasy-sports-players-differences/>
- Hamilton, M., Kaltcheva, V. D., & Rohm, A. J. (2016). Hashtags and handshakes: Consumer motives and platform use in brand-consumer interactions. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 33, 135–144.
- Hanna, N., & Wozniak, R. (2012). *Consumer behavior: An applied approach* (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Harris, L. C., & Reynolds, K. L. (2004). Jaycustomer behavior: An exploration of types and motives in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 18, 339–357.
- Heitner, D. (2015, September 16). The hyper growth of daily fantasy sports is going to change our culture and our laws. *Forbes: SportsMoney*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/darrenheitner/2015/09/16/the-hyper-growth-of-daily-fantasy-sports-is-going-to-change-our-culture-and-our-laws/#6cf673185f25>
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1–55.
- Jung, J. (1978). *Understanding human motivation: A cognitive approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Karg, A. J., & McDonald, H. (2011). Fantasy sport participation as a complement to traditional sport consumption. *Sport Management Review*, 14, 327–346.
- Kludt, T. (2015, October 8). DraftKings and FanDuel ads seem to be everywhere on TV because they are. *CNN Money*. Retrieved from <http://money.cnn.com/2015/10/08/media/fanduel-draftkings-commercials/>
- LaRose, R., Mastro, D., & Eastin, M. S. (2001). Understanding Internet usage: A social-cognitive approach to uses and gratifications. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19, 395–418.
- McQuail, D. (2001). With more hindsight: Conceptual problems and some ways forward for media use research. *Communications*, 26, 337–350.
- McQuail, D. (2010). *Mass communication theory: An introduction* (6th ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Neighbors, C., Lostutter, T. W., Cronce, J. M., & Larimer, M. E. (2002). Exploring college student gambling motivation. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 18, 361–370.
- Nesbit, T. M., & King, K. A. (2010). The impact of fantasy sports on television viewership. *Journal of Media Economics*, 23, 24–41.
- Nieuwenhuis, S., Aston-Jones, G., & Cohen, J. D. (2005). Decision making, the P3, and the locus coeruleus norepinephrine system. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 510–532.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Payne, G. A., Severn, J. J., & Dozier, D. M. (1988). Uses and gratifications motives as indicators of magazine readership. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 65, 909–924.
- Pritchard, M. P., & Funk, D. C. (2006). Symbiosis and substitution in spectator sport. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 299–321.
- Ruihley, B. J., & Billings, A. C. (2013). Infiltrating the boys' club: Motivations for women's fantasy sport participation. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 48, 435–452.
- Sherry, J. L., Lucas, K., Greenberg, B. S., & Lachlan, K. (2006). Video game uses and gratifications as predictors of use and game preference. *Playing video games: Motives, Responses, and Consequences*, 24, 213–224.
- Spinda, J. S. W., & Haridakis, P. M. (2008). Exploring the motives of fantasy sports: A uses-and-gratifications approach. In L. W. Hugenberg, P. M. Haridakis, & A.C. Earnheardt (Eds.), *Sports mania: Essays on fandom and the media in the 21st century* (pp. 187–202).
- Stradbroke, S. (2015). Just 1.3% of daily fantasy sports players earn 91% of player profits. *Gambling News*. Retrieved from <http://calvinayre.com/2015/09/04/business/tiny-silver-daily-fantasy-sports-players-earn-bulk-profits/>
- Tadman, J. (2012). The UIGEA, Canada and the 'new' fantasy sports. *Gaming Law Review and Economics*, 16, 91–99.
- Taylor, J. W. (1977). A striking characteristic of innovators. *Journal of Market Research*, 14, 104–107.
- Weiss, T., & Schiele, S. (2013). Virtual worlds in competitive contexts: Analyzing eSports consumer needs. *Electronic Markets*, 23, 307–316.
- West, R. L., & Turner, L. H. (2010). *Introducing communication theory: Analysis and application*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Wu, J., Wang, S., & Tsai, H. (2010). Falling in love with online games: The uses and gratifications perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 1862–1871.