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ABSTRACT

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been an important topic in business and other disciplines due to its various benefits for both society (e.g., contributing to public health, safety, education, human rights, community well-being, environment) and organizations (e.g., attracting new customers, enhancing sales of products, developing positive brand image or reputation) (Inoue, 2011; Kim, 2015; Kotler & Lee, 2005; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Many consumers expect corporate organizations to demonstrate their commitments and contributions to the community (Marin, Ruiz, & Rubio, 2009; Walker & Heere, 2011). Thus, it is important to satisfy their expectations through social activities since consumers are considered as a valuable asset for many business organizations. Similarly, sporting organizations have utilized CSR activities for the communities to satisfy sport consumers’ expectations. Furthermore, sport has a positive impact on the community with unique features such as large media, public attention, star power, and positive health impacts (Buck, Lupinek, & Huberty, 2015; Ko et al., 2014; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Despite this, little investigation has been undertaken to examine the effects of CSR and its outcomes, as practiced by collegiate athletic departments.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was as follows: (1) to examine the influence of college sport consumers’ awareness of CSR on conative loyalty; (2) to identify the mediating effects of sport involvement and commitment in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty.

The results of SEM revealed awareness of CSR had a positive effect on sport involvement and commitment. The results also indicated sport involvement had a positive effect on commitment, and commitment had a positive effect on conative loyalty. However, both awareness of CSR and sport involvement had no significant effect on conative loyalty. Thus, the
follow-up analysis was performed without the direct paths that were not statistically significant to achieve model parsimony. Finally, all estimated parameters were statistically significant in the final SEM model. The study employed Bootstrapping method to identify indirect effects, and found mediating effect of sport involvement was identified in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty when the effect of commitment as a mediator was simultaneously examined.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) refers to “a commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions of corporate resources” (Kotler & Lee, 2005, p. 3). Ko, Rhee, Kim, and Kim (2014) indicated that CSR is “a significant theme based on moral, financial, and ethical judgements of corporate activities” (p, 73). Many business organizations have been expected to demonstrate their commitments and contributions to society (Paramio-Salcines, Babiak, & Walters, 2013). In this sense, CSR has been increasingly utilized to demonstrate the responsibility for business organizations through a variety of means, including corporate philanthropy, cause-related marketing, employee volunteerism, charity donations, and innovative programs to support community or non-profit organizations (Drumwright, 1994; Kim, 2015; Lichtenstein, Drumwright, & Braig, 2004).

The concept or definition of CSR has evolved since the 1950s, and was generally called social responsibility rather than CSR at that time (Carroll, 1999). Even though many scholars have a different perspective in terms of concept or definition of CSR (Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Brown, 2012; Carroll, 1999; Dahlsrud, 2008; Hanzaee & Rahpeima, 2013; Lantos, 2001; Turker, 2009a; Waddington, Chelladurai, & Skirstad, 2013; Walters & Tacon, 2010), most have held a view that the ultimate goal of CSR is to achieve a corporation’s objectives (e.g., making profits, satisfying stakeholders, and enhancing image or reputation) as well as to use its resources to benefit society (Lantos, 2011; Porter & Kramer, 2002; Sen, Bhattacharya, & Korschun, 2006; Vlachos, Tsamakos, Vrechopoulos, & Avramidis, 2009). In particular, Carroll (1979) provided economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary responsibilities as essential components of the social responsibilities of businesses, and his framework has become a fundamental concept of CSR in
the business literature. According to Carroll’s (1979) framework of CSR, economic responsibility refers to the production of goods and services for not only generating profits but also satisfying social needs while organizations respect legal responsibility. He also explained ethical responsibility as society’s expectation for what organizations should accomplish for the society even though it is not legally required. Lastly, he indicated discretionary responsibility as a voluntary effort to handle social issues or problems for the community.

Over the past several decades, the concept of CSR has received immense attention from both researchers and practitioners in business and other disciplines due to its various benefits including, but not limited to: (1) developing relationships between an organization and stakeholders, including investors, suppliers, consumers, employees, and governments (Lai, Chiu, Yang, & Pai, 2010), (2) obtaining favorable consumer awareness, attitudes, and a sense of attachment (Brown & Dacin, 1997; Hur, Kim, & Woo, 2014; Lee, Kim, Lee, & Li, 2012), (3) building a positive image or reputation (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Ko et al., 2014), (4) improving consumer satisfaction (Hur et al., 2014), and (5) enhancing financial performance for corporations (Breitbarth & Harris, 2008; Fatma, Rahman, & Khan, 2014; Huang, Yen, Liu, & Huang, 2014; Hur et al., 2014; Walker & Kent, 2009; Walker & Heere, 2011). Additionally, CSR initiatives create positive consumer behavioral outcomes, including purchase intentions, word of mouth, and donation intentions (Ko et al., 2014; Lichtenstein et al., 2004; Murray & Vogel, 1997; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Walker & Kent, 2009). Accordingly, many global and local corporate organizations, as corporate citizens in various industries, have utilized socially responsible activities as effective marketing and communication tools for demonstrating their commitments and contributions to the society (Ko et al., 2014; Paramio-Salcines et al., 2013; Walters & Tacon, 2010).
As CSR has become one of the significant components in the business literature, several scholars in the field of sport management have paid a great deal of attention to the concept of social responsibility and its positive impacts on consumer behavior (Kim, 2015). Babiak and Wolfe (2009) also stated that professional sporting organizations overlooked the social responsibility 15 years ago, but currently this has been an important subject in the context of sports. Accordingly, numerous sporting organizations have utilized a variety of socially responsible activities for their communities (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). This is because sport has a positive impact on the community with its unique features such as large media, public attention, star power, and positive health impacts (Buck et al., 2015; Ko et al., 2014; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Kim (2015) also asserted that “sport has the strong power to appeal to the public, especially young people” (p. 25). For the above reasons, the four major professional sport leagues in North America, including Major League Baseball (MLB), National Hockey League (NHL), National Football League (NFL), and National Basketball Association (NBA), have implemented socially responsible activities to develop and maintain a good relationship with their local communities (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Godfrey, 2009; Heinze, Soderstrom, & Zdroik, 2014; Inoue, Kent, & Lee, 2011; Kim, 2015). By engaging in various types of socially responsible activities such as community outreach programs and philanthropic activities (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Inoue et al., 2011), professional sport teams in the aforementioned leagues can be recognized as socially conscious organizations, which may build good relationships with their stakeholders as well as their society (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Lai et al., 2010).
Statement of the Problem

According to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Revenues and Expenses Report (2015), the ticket sales and cash contributions from alumni and others for NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) were the largest income sources. Thus, it is important to identify what influences consumer (e.g., college sport consumer) decision-making to attend sporting events (e.g., college football and basketball games), why they purchase the team’s merchandise, or why they donate to the organization. While consumers expect organizations (e.g., athletic department) to demonstrate their commitments and contributions to the community (Marin et al., 2009; Walker & Heere, 2011), it is worthwhile to understand the role of socially responsible activities that positively influence consumers’ behavioral outcomes (e.g., purchasing intention, attending games, and donation intention). In addition, by solving social issues or problems in the community, college athletic departments not only generate revenue but also obtain the greatest competitive benefit since socially responsible activities are considered as “building shared value rather than PR campaign” (Ko et al., 2014, p. 74). Inoue, Mahan, and Kent (2013) indicated consumers’ awareness of CSR can provide benefits for both society and organizations. More specifically, understanding of college sport consumers’ awareness in regard to socially responsible activities implemented by collegiate athletic departments and its influences on their behavioral outcomes may be one of the critical elements for developing successful collegiate sports. However, limited studies have been examined to measure college sport consumers’ awareness of CSR. Walker and Heere (2011) indicated that “the lack of awareness research is likely then, to be a major inhibitor in interpreting consumer responsiveness to CSR” (p. 156). Ko et al. (2014) also stated that “surprisingly there have been few attempts to systematically
examine a theoretical framework that helps explain how CSR works in the minds of consumers” (p. 74).

Along with the growing perceived concern with CSR in the business literature, socially responsible activity is “gaining considerable currency in the sport industry” (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006, p. 215). Accordingly, several scholars in the field of sport management have recently examined the concept of CSR. For instance, Babiak and Wolfe (2006) examined CSR activities related to the Super Bowl in Detroit. Heinze et al. (2014) explored strategic and authentic CSR in professional sports by analyzing a case study of the Detroit Lions. Inoue and his colleagues (2011) analyzed the link between CSR and financial performance for professional sport teams. Walters and Tacon (2010) observed CSR in the UK football industry. Walker, Heere, Parent, and Drane (2010) examined the relationship between CSR activities and their outcomes (e.g., word of mouth, reputation, repeat purchase, and merchandise consumption) in the Olympic Games by mediating effect of consumer attribution. To date, the majority of research in the context of sports, including the aforementioned studies conducted to examine CSR activities, only focused on professional sports or mega sporting events (e.g., FIFA World Cup, Olympic Games, Super Bowl, etc.). Many collegiate athletic departments in the United States are actively engaged in CSR activities, similar to the CSR activities of professional sport leagues and teams in North America, in order to fulfill the expectation of their local communities (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006, 2009; Babiak, Mills, Tainsky, & Juravich, 2012; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007; Walker & Kent, 2009). Moreover, collegiate sports are as popular as professional sports in the United States since they can develop college culture by enhancing a sense of community among college students on campus
(Clopton, 2011; Polite, Waller, Trendafilova, & Spearman, 2011). However, there is a dearth of research that empirically examines the outcome of CSR, as practiced by collegiate athletic departments. Polite et al. (2011) also indicated “CSR has been reviewed extensively in the realm of professional sports, but scholarship related to CSR and its application in collegiate sports is lacking” (p. 111).

Several scholars have examined mediating effects in the relationship between CSR and behavioral outcomes (e.g., loyalty, purchasing intention, etc.) to date. Some scholars in the business literature identified indirect effect of CSR (e.g., perceived CSR, CSR association, awareness of philanthropy, etc.) on loyalty through psychological aspects (e.g., attitude, trust, satisfaction, customer-corporate identification, credibility, etc.). For instance, Vlachos et al. (2009) employed trust as a mediator to investigate the relationship between CSR and behavioral intentions (i.e., repeat patronage and recommendations). Walsh and Bartikowski (2013) examined the mediating role of consumer satisfaction in the relation between CSR and behavioral outcomes such as word of mouth and loyalty. Hur and his colleagues (2014) examined the influence of CSR on corporate brand equity mediated by the effects of corporate brand credibility and reputation. In sport management literature, Ko et al. (2014) used trust and commitment as mediators in determining the influence of perceived CSR on donation intentions in collegiate sports. Inoue, Funk, and McDonald (2015) utilized sport involvement as a mediator in the relationship between perceived CSR and consumer loyalty. They highlighted sport involvement as a key factor in the relation. This is consistent with the study conducted by Kwon and Trail (2003) which indicated that identifying psychological constructs (e.g., sport involvement and commitment) is important in consumer behavior since these factors influence the level of sport consumption. Tachis and Tzetzis (2015) also suggested sport teams should
identify the psychological factors that influence sport consumers’ loyalty in order to develop a successful team. Most recently, Inoue, Funk, and McDonald (2017) employed involvement and commitment as mediators to examine the relationship between perceived CSR and behavioral loyalty, and found involvement played mediating role between perceived CSR and attendance frequency while commitment had negative effect on attendance frequency through involvement. However, no comprehensive framework has existed in a collegiate sport setting to explain college sport consumers’ behaviors formed by the relationship among awareness of CSR, sport involvement, commitment, and conative loyalty. In addition, limited studies have focused on sport involvement and commitment in sport management literature, in terms of predicting consumer behavior, including supporting a team, purchasing favorite team’s merchandise, and participating in sporting events (Beaton, Funk, Ridinger, & Jordan, 2011; Tachis & Tzetisis, 2015).

Given this commentary, this study is intended to examine the role of college sport consumers’ awareness of socially responsible activities conducted by a collegiate athletic department in determining their conative loyalty (i.e., attending future games, purchasing team merchandise, buying team clothing, and supporting the team). In addition, this study is intended to identify how sport involvement and commitment play a role as mediators in the relationship between consumers’ awareness of CSR and conative loyalty.

**Significance of the Study**

This study can provide three significant implications. First, the study attempts to provide an empirical contribution by examining the influence of consumers’ awareness of CSR on their conative loyalty in a collegiate sports setting. While many scholars (e.g., Babiak & Wolfe, 2006;
Heinze et al., 2014; Inoue et al., 2011; Walters & Tacon, 2010; Walker et al., 2010) have examined CSR in professional sport leagues or sport teams to date, limited studies have examined the role of socially responsible activities in the context of collegiate sports. Therefore, this study can contribute to the literature focusing on collegiate sports by investigating college sport consumers’ awareness regarding socially responsible activities implemented by collegiate athletic departments and its outcomes.

Second, this study attempts to identify whether or not sport involvement and commitment are key constructs as mediators between college sport consumers’ awareness of CSR and conative loyalty. As noted, many scholars have examined mediating effects in the relationship between CSR and behavioral outcomes to date. In particular, Inoue et al. (2015) and Ko et al. (2014) utilized involvement and commitment as a mediator in the relationship between CSR and its outcomes (e.g., attitudinal and behavioral loyalty, donation intention) respectively. Several studies in the leisure study also examined how commitment mediated in the relationship between involvement and loyalty (Iwasaki & Havitz, 2004; Tachis & Tzetzis, 2015). None of the studies has existed to explain sport consumers’ behaviors formed by the relationship among constructs, including CSR activities, sport involvement, commitment, and conative loyalty except one conducted by Inoue et al. (2017). Although Inoue and his colleagues (2017) utilized similar constructs with this study, it is still worthwhile in terms of difference of the proposed model. For instance, this study measured a direct effect of awareness of CSR on commitment and conative loyalty. The study also hypothesized mediating role of commitment in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty while Inoue et al. (2017) proposed the positive effect of involvement on behavioral loyalty through commitment, and found commitment negatively predicted behavioral loyalty. Moreover, this study utilized conative loyalty, including attitudinal
and behavioral aspects as an outcome variable while Inoue et al. (2017) investigated CSR’s link to behavioral loyalty using attendance frequency rather than measuring attitudinal and behavioral aspects. Therefore, this study may improve to identify both attitudinal and behavioral consequences toward CSR activities since using only one aspect is not sufficient to measure true loyalty precisely (Evanschitzky & Wunderlich, 2006; Han, Kim, & Kim, 2011; Oliver, 1997). To sum, understanding the role of sport involvement and commitment as mediators, between consumers’ awareness of CSR and conative loyalty can provide a meaningful insight into sport management literature.

Finally, this study attempts to provide a significant implication in terms of measuring college sport consumers’ awareness of CSR on their conative loyalty for sport marketers or athletic directors in collegiate sporting organizations. Several scholars (e.g., Inoue et al., 2013, Walker & Heere, 2011) indicated that positive awareness that consumers have toward organizations’ socially responsible activities can provide positive outcomes (e.g., purchasing intention, attending sporting games, and donation intention) for corporations and society. Kim (2015) asserted that “CSR activities cannot avoid the critical view that they only used to bolster business, avoid regulation, gain legitimacy, and advance reputation without a proper measurement tool to gauge its applications” (p. 9). By deeply understanding the role of consumers’ awareness regarding socially responsible activities, sport marketers or athletic directors in sporting organizations can improve their image or reputation, as well as reduce criticisms from consumers by conducting strategic social activities, and it may result in an increase of revenue for organizations in the long run (Ko et al., 2014).
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to examine the influence of college sport consumers’ awareness of socially responsible activities conducted by a collegiate athletic department on their conative loyalty. Second, this study attempts to identify the mediating effects of sport involvement as well as commitment in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty.

Hypotheses Development

CSR and Sport Involvement

Inoue et al. (2015) indicated that sport consumers’ awareness in regard to socially responsible activities had a direct positive association with sport involvement. In addition, they identified sport involvement as a key construct linking CSR with consumer loyalty, including attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. As another study, Inoue et al., (2017) found that perceived CSR had a significant positive effect on involvement. Iwasaki and Havitz (1998) provided antecedent factors of involvement, particularly personal benefits (e.g., satisfaction). From this perspective, CSR may be seen as an attribute of the organization that generates personal benefits because when consumers perceive socially responsible activities of their favorite organization, consumers have a good feeling toward the organization (Inoue et al., 2015). Based on the preceding, the following hypothesis was developed:

- Hypothesis 1: Sport consumers’ awareness of a collegiate athletic department’s socially responsible activities has a direct positive effect on sport involvement.
**CSR and Commitment**

Ko et al. (2014) examined the relationship between perceived CSR and donor behavior in college athletics, and found that CSR activities had positively related to donors’ commitment. That is, when consumers (e.g., college athletic donors) perceive socially responsible activities of an organization, they tend to have a high level of commitment toward the organization. Therefore, the following hypothesis was established:

- **Hypothesis 2**: Sport consumers’ awareness of a collegiate athletic department’s socially responsible activities has a direct positive effect on commitment.

**CSR and Conative Loyalty**

Previous research in CSR has demonstrated that socially responsible activities provide various benefits for organizations, including consumer’s awareness, attitude, corporate image, reputation, consumer satisfaction, stakeholder relationship, and corporate financial performance (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Breitbarth & Harris, 2008; Brown & Dacin, 1997; Lai et al., 2010; Fatma et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2014; Hur et al., 2014; Ko et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2012; Walker & Kent, 2009; Walker & Heere, 2011). In particular, Inoue et al. (2015) asserted that CSR activities have a positive association with attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. Attitudinal loyalty refers to “consumers’ sense of specific products or service,” and behavioral loyalty means “consumers’ repurchase behavioral or intention of specific brand” (Cheng, 2011, p. 151). Similarly, Walker and Kent (2009) found that consumers’ perception of CSR positively influences patronage intentions, including merchandise consumption and word of mouth intention. This study utilizes the concept of conative loyalty, including attending future games, purchasing team merchandise, buying team clothing, and supporting the team in order to identify
the impact of CSR on consumer loyalty. Conative loyalty would be used as the substitute for consumer loyalty (e.g., attitudinal and behavioral loyalty) in this study. Trail, Anderson, and Fink (2005) also used this concept to measure behavioral intentions, since it can be a good predictor of future consumption. In sum, it was hypothesized that:

- Hypothesis 3: Sport consumers’ awareness of a collegiate athletic department’s socially responsible activities has a direct positive effect on conative loyalty.

**Sport Involvement and Commitment**

The relationship between involvement and commitment has been well-documented in the leisure study. In particular, several scholars (e.g., Beatty, Kahle, & Homer, 1988; Bee & Havitz, 2010; Bloch, Black, & Lichtenstein, 1989; Buchanan, 1985; Iwasaki & Havitz, 1998; Scanlan, Carpenter, Schmidt, Simons, & Keeler, 1993) found that involvement plays an antecedent role in developing commitment. For instance, Scanlan et al. (1993) explained the antecedent of commitment, and found “feelings of attraction to continued involvement and perceptions of necessity to remain involved” (p. 3) are antecedents of commitment. Iwasaki and Havitz (1998) proposed personal involvement in a recreational activity is an antecedent of psychological commitment. Beatty et al. (1998) asserted that involvement positively influenced brand commitment in the business literature. Kyle and Mowen (2005) investigated the relationship between leisure involvement and commitment, and found there was partial support for the relationship. This is because the authors utilized multi-dimensional constructs of both factors. Bee and Havitz (2010) noted that involvement had a positive and significant influence on psychological commitment. Tachis and Tzetzis (2015) found sport fans’ involvement positively influenced psychological commitment in a professional sport setting. Most recently, Inoue et al.
also stated that “consumers’ involvement level with the use of the company’s products determines the extent to which they develop strong commitment to that company” (p. 49), and found involvement was positively associated with commitment. From this perspective, the following hypothesis was developed:

- Hypothesis 4: Sport involvement has a direct positive effect on commitment.

**Sport Involvement and Conative Loyalty**

Sport involvement is defined as “the degree to which individuals evaluate their connection with the sports object based on whether the sports object provides hedonic and symbolic values and is central to their life” (Kunkel, Hill, & Funk, 2013, p. 178). Several scholars (e.g., Armstrong, 2002; Backman & Crompton, 1991) stated that involvement is one of the important constructs in consumer behavior because it can predict various aspects of sport consumer behavior such as attending sporting events, participating in sports, and purchasing sport-related merchandise. Bee and Havitz (2010) also asserted that involvement is an essential precondition for attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. Similarly, Hill and Green (2000) explained the importance of psychological involvement on consumer’s intentions to participate in sport activities and attend sporting events. In particular, the level of involvement is an important determinant of consumer behavior since it is explained as the degree of personal relevance or importance (Beatty et al., 1988; Ko, Kim, Kim, & Lee, 2010; Peter & Olson, 1987; Traylor, 1981). For instance, Shapiro and Ridinger (2011) indicated the level of involvement depends on characteristics of the person, the product, and the situation which, in turn, influenced consumer behavior and purchase intentions. Armstrong (2002) stated the level of sport involvement had a significant influence on sport event attendance and consumption. It means that a consumer who
has a high level of involvement is more likely to attend sporting event as well as purchase the products or services. This is because the level of involvement and loyalty are highly and positively correlated (Park, 1996). Recently, Inoue et al. (2017) also found that involvement had a positive effect on behavioral loyalty. Along with the effect of involvement on conative loyalty, involvement can be utilized as a mediator in the relationship between CSR and conative loyalty. As an example, Inoue et al. (2015) identified the mediating effect of sport involvement between perceived CSR and loyalty, and found sport involvement positively mediated in the relationship. The finding was consistent with the study conducted by Inoue et al. (2017) which indicated there was indirect positive effect of perceived CSR on attendance frequency through involvement. Accordingly, this study proposed the following hypotheses:

- **Hypothesis 5:** Sport involvement has a direct positive effect on conative loyalty.
- **Hypothesis 6:** Sport involvement plays a mediating role in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty.

**Commitment and Conative Loyalty**

The role of commitment in predicting consumer behavior (e.g., loyalty) has been supported by several scholars in the field of sport management (Bee & Havitz, 2010; Fernandes, Correia, Abreu, & Biscaia, 2013; Weiss & Weiss, 2006). For example, Bee and Havitz (2010) found that psychological commitment had significant relationship with behavioral loyalty. Magnusen, Kim, and Kim (2012) indicated commitment is “a main driver of sport consumer attendance behavior” (p.507), and found commitment positively affected sport consumer attendance intention. Fernandes et al. (2013) examined the relationship between sport commitment and three types of sport consumer behaviors, including participation frequency,
sporting good consumption, and media consumption. The result of their study showed that sport commitment positively influenced all three types of sport consumer behaviors. Ko et al. (2014) identified the college sport donors’ commitment was positively related to their donation intention. Tachis and Tzetpis (2015) also demonstrated sport fans’ psychological commitment positively influenced attitudinal and behavioral loyalty in a professional sport setting. In addition, the construct of commitment was frequently used as a mediator in the leisure study in order to identify the aspect of consumer loyalty (Bee & Havitz, 2010; Iwasaki & Havitz, 2004). For example, Magnusen et al. (2012) investigated the mediating role of commitment in the relationship between reciprocity and sport consumer attendance intention, and found commitment positively mediated in the relationship. Ko et al. (2014) also demonstrated that commitment was a significant mediator in the relationship between perceived CSR and donation intention. Based on the foregoing discussion, the author hypothesized the following:

- Hypothesis 7: Commitment has a direct positive effect on conative loyalty.
- Hypothesis 8: Commitment plays a mediating role in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty.
The current study contains the following three delimitations prior to beginning the data collection. First, the study utilizes the convenient sampling method to collect data. Due to the limited scope of the study, the result of this study cannot be generalized to the population.

Second, although this study explicitly examines the role of sport involvement and commitment as mediators in the relationship between college sport consumers’ awareness of CSR and their conative loyalty, the extant literature suggests that other substitutable variables, such as attitude toward organization (Ailawadi, Neslin, Luan, & Taylor, 2014), fan attachment (Scheinbaum & Lacey, 2015), credibility of the sponsor (Uhrich, Koenigstorfer, & Groeppel-Klein, 2014; Walker & Kent, 2012), pride (Chang, Ko, Connaughton, & Kang, 2016), team
identification (Chang et al., 2016; He & Li, 2011; Walker & Kent, 2009), satisfaction (He & Li, 2011; Walsh & Bartikowski, 2013), trust (Ko et al., 2014; Pivato, Misani, & Tencati, 2008; Vlachos et al., 2009), and brand equity (Hur et al., 2014), can be utilized to identify the relationship.

Third, the study utilizes conative loyalty as an outcome variable influenced by awareness of CSR. Although the concept of conative loyalty is considered as the best predictor of actual consumption as well as the substitute for consumers’ attitudinal and behavioral loyalty (Trail et al., 2005) with various types of consumption behaviors, including attending sporting events, purchasing team merchandise, and supporting team psychologically, other types of consumption behaviors (e.g., word of mouth, media consumption, etc.) may be used as outcome variables influenced by CSR activities (Fernandes et al., 2013).

**Definitions of Terms**

Attitudinal loyalty – Sport consumers’ emotional and psychological attachment toward sport products such as sport games, teams, and athletes (Cheng, 2011; DeWitt, Nguyen, & Marshall, 2008).

Behavioral loyalty – Actual sport consumer’s consistent and repetitious purchase behavior related to the objects such as sport products and sporting events (Bee & Havitz, 2010; Cheng, 2011; DeWitt et al., 2008).

Collegiate athletic department – A unit to manage collegiate athletic teams at NCAA institutions (Brown, 2012).

Commitment – An internal psychological state of mind college sport consumers have toward their favorite college athletic program (Heere & Dickson, 2008).
Conative loyalty – “An intention or commitment to behave toward a goal in a particular manner” (Oliver, 1997, p. 393).

CSR – A collegiate athletic department’s commitment to improve community well-being as well as its contribution of resources to the community (Kotler & Lee, 2005).

Sport consumer – An individual who is interested in sport objects (e.g., particular teams, sports, and sport players/coaches) as well as attracted to the consumption activities of sport, including attending or watching sporting events, purchasing sport-related products, participating in sport activities (Kim, 2015; Kunkel et al., 2013; Milne & McDonald, 1999; Shank & Beasley, 1998).

Sport involvement – The importance or perceived interest in a sport to the sport consumers (Hill & Green, 2000; Shank & Beasley, 1998).

Stakeholders – “A group or individual who can affect or be affected by the actions or performance of the objectives of the organization” (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). Stakeholders in this study consist of college students who are familiar with their college sport teams or who watched their sporting events, attended sporting events, purchased sport-related merchandises, or participated in sport activities in college campus.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents a literature review relevant to the theoretical framework of the current study as follows: (a) corporate social responsibility in terms of historical concept or definition, other types of CSR, consequences of CSR, and CSR in sports, (b) involvement in terms of the concept of involvement, level of involvement, sport involvement, and its positive association with consumer behavior, (c), commitment in terms of the concept of commitment and sport commitment model, and (d) loyalty, including the concept of loyalty, attitudinal and behavioral loyalty, and four stages of loyalty.

Corporate Social Responsibility

Over the past decades, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has received a great deal of attention across multiple academic literatures since socially responsible activities have become an effective marketing or communication tool to strengthen the relationship between stakeholders (e.g., investors, suppliers, consumers, employees, and governments) and organizations (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Bhattacharya, Korschun, & Sen, 2009; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Du, Bhattacharya, & Sen, 2007; Margolis & Walsh, 2003; Pirsch, Gupta, & Grau, 2007; Ramasamy & Ting, 2004; Ross, Stutts, & Patterson, 1991). Consumers expect organizations to demonstrate their efforts by solving social issues or problems for the community, and organizations requisite to satisfy consumers’ needs since many consumers evaluate the organizations based on their efforts in social activities (Marin et al., 2009). Accordingly, it is very important for organizations to develop well-planned social activities by identifying what social issues or problems existed in their
communities (Ko et al., 2014). Lee, Park, Moon, Yang, and Kim (2009) also indicated that many business organizations are expected to exhibit their social and community actions as corporate citizens. For those reasons, many corporate organizations, such as Avon, Coca-Cola, Starbucks, and Home Depot, have implemented various social activities (e.g., monetary contributions, in-kind gifts, sponsorship of community activities, and financial support of employee volunteerism) in order to enhance the relationship with stakeholders (Extejt, 2004; Lichtenstein et al., 2004). Having a good public image or reputation is important to organizations since it can be regarded as a valuable asset in terms of improving consumer satisfaction and building positive consumer evaluation (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Brown & Dacin, 1997; Kim, Lee, Lee, & Kim, 2010). In addition, Marin et al. (2009) stated that socially responsible activities have positive impact on consumer behaviors such as consumer product responses, positive attitude toward the organization, and consumer loyalty. Thus, many business organizations around the world consider their socially responsible activities as an investment which, in turn, provides many benefits for the organization as well as for the society (Walker & Heere, 2011).

**Historical Concept and Definition of CSR**

Although the concept of CSR has evolved and been developed over the last 50 years in the business literature, many scholars have a different perspective in terms of concept or definition of CSR (Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Brown, 2012; Carroll, 1999; Dahlsrud, 2008; Hanzaee & Rahpeima, 2013; Lantos, 2001; Turker, 2009a; Waddington et al., 2013; Walker & Heere, 2011; Walters & Tacon, 2010). Walker and Heere (2011) proposed the reason that “the term CSR is essentially umbrella term” (p.154). This is because the term of CSR was described as “a wide variety of business roles in the provision of some social good beyond the core role of
making a profit for owners and shareholders” (Kim, 2015, p. 16). In other words, CSR covers a variety of domains, including environment issues, social issues (e.g., health, education, etc.), worker equity, community development, consumer protection, ethical standard, and fair-trade (Walker & Heere, 2011). Accordingly, several scholars have examined the definitions of CSR over the past decades. For example, Carroll (1999) reviewed various definitions of CSR that were introduced from the 1950s to the 1990s. Since then, Dahlsrud (2008) examined how CSR is defined by analyzing 37 definitions of CSR. Even though it is difficult to get a consensus definition of CSR among scholars since they have different perspectives in the role of CSR, it is important to understand a general concept of CSR because misunderstanding of it may lead to serious problems (e.g., negative word of mouth) for organizations (Brown, 2012; Dahlsrud, 2008; Godfrey, 2009; Jones, 1980; Waddington et al., 2013).

Table 1.1. Definitions of Corporate Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowen (1953)</td>
<td>“The obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society” (p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (1960)</td>
<td>“Businessmen’s decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm’s direct economic or technical interest” (p. 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire (1963)</td>
<td>“Corporation has not only economic and legal obligations but also certain responsibilities to society which extend beyond these obligations” (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis and Blomstrom (1975)</td>
<td>“The managerial obligation to take action to protect and improve both the welfare of society as a whole and the interest of organizations” (p. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year)</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll (1979)</td>
<td>“The social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time” (p. 500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones (1980)</td>
<td>“CSR is the notion that corporations have an obligation to constituent groups in society other than stockholders and beyond that prescribed by law and union contract” (p. 59-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ullmann (1985)</td>
<td>“The extent to which an organization meets the needs, expectations, and demands of certain external constituencies beyond those directly linked to the company’s products/markets” (p. 543)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWilliams and Siegel (2001)</td>
<td>“Actions that appear to further some social good, beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law” (p. 117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr, Webb, and Harris (2001)</td>
<td>“A company’s commitment to minimizing or eliminating any harmful effects and maximizing its long-run beneficial impact on society” (p. 47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddock (2004)</td>
<td>“CSR is the subset of corporate responsibilities that deals with a company’s voluntary/discretionary relationships with its societal and community stakeholders” (p. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotler and Lee (2005)</td>
<td>“Commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions of corporate resources” (p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker and Parent (2010)</td>
<td>“CSR implies that businesses are responsible for assessing their wider impact on society and regardless of specific labeling” (p. 198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharr and Lough (2012)</td>
<td>“The obligation or intent of a corporation to be ethical and accountable to not only the stakeholders but to society as well” (p. 94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The beginning of socially responsible activities stems from the beginning of philanthropy in the United States (Carroll, 1999; Sheth & Babiak, 2010). Hwang (2015) specifically identified that the forms of charitable donation and philanthropy are considered the origin of socially responsible activities. It is consistent with the research from Godfrey (2009) which indicated that philanthropy is the form of the oldest socially responsible activity among American enterprises. Philanthropy in the business literature is defined as “businesses’ charitable giving to community not-for-profit organizations” (Extejt, 2004, p. 215). Philanthropy is one of the enormous financial enterprises in the United States (Godfrey, 2009) since corporate donation has reached $17.77 billion in 2014, an increase of 13.7% compared to the previous year (Giving USA, 2015).

Numerous scholars in multiple academic literatures (e.g., Brown, 2012; Carroll, 1999; Huang et al., 2014; Paramio-Salcines et al., 2013; Polite et al., 2011; Turker, 2009a) have regarded Bowen’s (1953) work, *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*, as an initial and seminal work on the subject of CSR in the modern era. Bowen (1953) defined CSR as “the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society” (p. 6). Through the book, he suggested that businessmen should be responsible for their decision that may benefit the organization as well as the society (Bowen, 1953). Moreover, Carroll (1999) called him as the *Father of Corporate Social Responsibility*, and the term of CSR has been used since this era (Hwang, 2015).

Keith Davis was considered one of the most prominent scholars on CSR in the 1960s (Carroll, 1999; Hwang, 2015; Kim, 2015; Polite et al., 2011). Davis (1960) defined CSR as “businessmen’s decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm’s direct economic or technical interest” (p. 70). He asserted that the relationship
between social responsibility and business power should be parallel. In other words, as corporate organizations have more power in a community, they have more responsibility in that community. In this sense, the key point in his work is that corporate organizations should justify long-term financial benefit through socially responsible activities (Davis, 1960). It is parallel with the research conducted by Walton (1967) which indicated that corporate organizations should not consider economic returns when they organize socially responsible activities for society. This is because volunteerism was the foundation of CSR activities (Walton, 1967). On the other hand, another major contributor, Friedman (1962), argued that corporate organizations should focus more on maximizing profits in order to satisfy stakeholders rather than supporting their communities. In addition, Carroll (1999) described Frederick (1960) and McGuire (1963) as other leading contributors of CSR in this era.

By the 1970s, the definition of CSR was not only diverse but also specific (Carroll, 1999). Several studies conducted by Steiner (1971), Johnson (1971), Manne and Wallich (1972), Eilbert and Parket (1973), and Eells and Walton (1974) defined CSR respectively from their various points of view (Carroll, 1999). For instance, Johnson (1971) provided four different views of CSR. First of all, he argued that corporate organizations should recognize the benefits for stockholders as well as stakeholders, such as employees, customers, suppliers, dealers, communities, and the nation, before implementing CSR activities. This is because CSR can be considered one of the important elements in stakeholder management (Freeman, 1984). Stakeholder is explained as “a group or individual who can affect or be affected by the actions or performance of the objectives of the firm” (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). Thus, his argument may form the foundation of current stakeholder models (Carroll, 1999). As a second view, Johnson (1971) indicated that corporate organizations conduct socially responsible programs in order to get long-
run profits for the organizations. Third, the author asserted that “the prime motivation of the business firm is utility maximization” (p. 59). This means that corporate organizations should take both socially responsible programs and profits simultaneously into account. This argument was supported by Bradish and Cronin (2009) indicating that CSR is not pure philanthropy, and therefore it should be conducted by incorporating both social and economic interests. Lastly, Johnson (1971) explained lexicographic view of social responsibility which describes that the more profits corporate organizations want, the more socially responsible behaviors they engage in. Previous research from the Committee for Economic Development (CED) is also considered the most significant contribution regarding the concept of CSR in this era (Carroll, 1999). CED (1971) proposed three concentric circles, including inner, intermediate, and outer circle to define CSR. According to CED (1971), (1) the inner circle refers to “the clear-cut basic responsibilities for the efficient execution of the economic function such as product, jobs, and economic growth”; (2) the intermediate circle refers to “the responsibility to exercise this economic function with a sensitive awareness of changing social values and priorities”; and (3) the outer circle refers to “newly emerging and still amorphous responsibilities that business should assume to become more broadly involved in actively improving the social environment” (p. 15). While CED’s (1971) conceptualization proposed a broad categorization of CSR (Brown, 2012), Carroll’s (1979) framework provided four domains of social responsibilities concretely, including economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary responsibilities. Particularly, his framework was the most cited across multiple academic disciplines (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Godfrey, 2009; Turker, 2009b). According to Carroll (1979), (1) economic responsibility refers to the production
of products or services that satisfies society’s needs or wants and then selling them at a profit; (2) legal responsibility indicates that society expects organizations to observe the law while operating the business; (3) ethical responsibility refers to behaviors or activities of an organization which are not legal requirements, but these activities are expected by society; and (4) discretionary responsibility refers to behavior or activity of an organization that are completely voluntary, but society expects organizations to do the voluntary activities such as cash donation, sponsorship of community activities, etc.

In the 1980s, several studies were conducted to explain alternative concepts of CSR, such as public policy, corporate social performance, business ethics theory, and stakeholder theory, rather than developing the definition of CSR (Carroll, 1999; Kim, 2015). In particular, stakeholder theory received a lot of attention in this era (Hanzaee & Rahpeima, 2013). Jones (1980) examined CSR with an interesting perspective. He defined CSR as “the notion that corporations have an obligation to constituent groups in society other than stockholders and beyond that prescribed by law and union contract” (p. 59-60), and emphasized the importance of two facets of it. First, “the obligation must be voluntarily adopted; behavior influenced by the coercive forces of law or union contract is not voluntary” (Jones, 1980, p. 60). Second, “the obligation is a broad one, extending beyond the traditional duty to shareholders of other societal groups such as customers, employees, suppliers, and neighboring communities” (Jones, 1980, p. 60). Accordingly, the author posited that CSR should be seen as a process rather than its outcomes while it is difficult to reach consensus of the definition of CSR. As Jones (1980) noted two important facets of CSR, Carroll (1983) made slight modification of his previous framework by restating the discretionary component as voluntary or philanthropic because this seems to be a better description of the discretionary component. As another notable scholar in this era,
Freeman (1984) emphasized that corporate organizations have a mutual relationship with stakeholders, including governments, competitors, consumers, and the media beyond traditional stakeholders (e.g., owners, customers, and employees) while conducting CSR activities.

There were very few contributions in attempt to define CSR in the 1990s. This is because numerous scholars had grown more focused on alternative themes such as stakeholder theory, business ethics, and corporate citizenship in this era (Carroll, 1999; Hanzae & Rahpeima, 2013; Kim, 2015; Walters & Tacon, 2010). Compared with Carroll’s (1979) framework, Wood (1991) developed the framework from a different point of view. He specified CSR more precisely by identifying three principles: institutional principle (i.e., legitimacy), organizational principle (i.e., public responsibility), and individual principle (i.e., managerial discretion). First, the principle of legitimacy refers to “a societal-level concept and describes the responsibility of business as a social institution that must avoid abusing its power” (Wood, 1991, p. 695). Second, the principle of public responsibility refers to the responsibility at the level of individual organization to solve any social problems relevant to its business (Wood, 1991). Lastly, the principle of managerial discretion indicates that managers in business organizations are expressed as moral actors those who are obliged to make decisions on any social issues or problems (Wood, 1991). Thus, managers or leaders in corporate organizations can utilize socially responsible activities as a strategic marketing tool in order to improve their social and economic performances (Bradish & Cronin, 2009).

While the concept of CSR has evolved and been developed by many researchers (e.g., Bowen, 1953; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Carroll, 1979; Davis, 1960; Eells & Walton,
1974; Eilbert & Parket, 1973; Johnson, 1971; Jones, 1980; Lantos, 2001; Manne & Wallich, 1972; Steiner, 1971; Walton, 1967; Wood, 1991), the concept of CSR was classified into three categories (e.g., ethical, altruistic, and strategic) by Lantos (2001) in the early 21st century. According to Lantos (2001), (1) ethical responsibility refers to “moral responsibility to any individuals or groups where it might inflict actual or potential injury (e.g., physical, mental, economic, spiritual, and emotional) from particular course of action” (p. 606); (2) altruistic responsibility, also called humanitarian responsibility, refers to genuine optional caring from organization as a corporate citizen; and (3) strategic responsibility refers to the responsibility to fulfill its business goals by doing something good for business as well as society. As another concept of CSR, Broomhill (2007) conceptually categorized CSR into three parts, including neoliberalism, neo-Keynesianism, and radical political economy. Neoliberalism indicates that corporate organizations engage in social activities only for increasing their profits (Broomhill, 2007; Waddington et al., 2013). On the contrary to neoliberalism, neo-Keynesianism indicates that corporate organizations widely implement socially responsible activities beyond the interests of the corporate organizations such as making profits (Broomhill, 2007; Waddington et al., 2013). Lastly, radical political economy does not mean that CSR activities can contribute to support social issues, but it suggests that the major beneficiary of socially responsible activities is the corporate organizations because implementing socially responsible activities is for the sake of profits, survival, and growth (Broomhill, 2007; Waddington et al., 2013). More recently, Hwang (2015) divided the concept of CSR into two categories, including obligatory (e.g., social) and strategic (e.g., organizational) perspectives. The obligatory perspective indicates that corporate organizations should focus more on social issues or problems rather than making profits while strategic perspective indicates that corporate organizations should focus on profits from socially
responsible activities (Hwang, 2015). Along with increased corporate globalization, both social and environmental issues have been sharply raised among global corporate organizations in the 21st century (Hanzaee & Rahpeima, 2013; Turker, 2009a). D’Aprile and Talò (2014) stated that a new concept of CSR would be needed in order to accomplish both economic growth and conservation of nature. Hwang (2015) also indicated that strategic CSR should be needed in order to achieve not only the organization’s objective but also social benefit. Thus, it is important for global corporate organizations to balance social, economic, and environmental issues.

Other Types of CSR

Kotler and Lee (2005) defined corporate social initiatives as “major activities undertaken by a corporation to support social causes and to fulfill commitments to corporate social responsibility” (p. 22). The authors also identified six types of corporate social initiatives, including cause promotions, cause-related marketing (CRM), corporate social marketing (CSM), corporate philanthropy, community volunteering, and socially responsible business practices. First, cause promotions refer to corporation’s socially responsible activities, not only to increase awareness by providing funds, in-kind contribution, and other corporate resources, but also to support fundraising, participation, and volunteer recruitment for a cause (Kotler & Lee, 2005). Second, CRM was defined as “activity by which businesses and charities or causes form a partnership with each other to market an image, product or service for mutual benefit” (Adkins, 1999, p. 11). Although some scholars (e.g., Adkins, 1999; File & Prince, 1998) identified cause-related marketing as another type of corporate philanthropy, CRM differs from corporate
philanthropy or other corporate social initiatives in that the level of corporate contribution depends on the sale of products. In other words, corporate organizations contribute a certain portion of revenue from product sales to a social cause (Kotler & Lee, 2005; Varadarajan & Menon, 1988). By doing so, corporate organizations get a variety of benefits such as attracting new customers, enhancing sales of products, and developing positive brand image or reputation (Kotler & Lee, 2005). Third, CSM is defined as “a means whereby a corporation supports the development and/or implementation of a behavior change campaign intended to improve public health, safety, the environment, or community well-being” (Kotler & Lee, 2005, p. 114). In particular, Pharr and Lough (2012) identified CRM and CSM as marketing strategies to achieve CSR. However, the authors also posited that CRM and CSM are completely different concepts in terms of different benefits, objective, outcome, target market, and marketing perspective. Fourth, corporate philanthropy refers to direct contributions of a corporate organization such as cash grants, donations, and in-kind services (Kotler & Lee, 2005). Inoue et al. (2013) stated that philanthropy is consistent with the concept of CSR since corporate organizations contribute their resources to society. Fifth, community volunteering refers to voluntary works to support local communities or non-profit organizations among individuals relevant to corporate organizations such as employees, retain partners, and franchise members (Kotler & Lee, 2005). Lastly, socially responsible business practices refer to discretionary business practices corporate organizations engage in to improve community health, well-being, and environment (Kotler & Lee, 2005).

Consequences of CSR

The consequences of CSR can be categorized by social and business benefits (Inoue et al., 2013). Many global corporate organizations have been expected to provide commitments and
contributions for society (Paramio-Salcines et al., 2013). In terms of social benefits, organizations’ social activities contribute to public health, safety, education, human rights, community well-being, and environment (Inoue, 2011; Hwang, 2015). For instance, many collegiate athletic departments in the United States have implemented environmental programs, such as recycling at all sporting events (e.g., college football and basketball games), which conserve the nature by reducing waste in the long run (Trendafilova, Pfahl, & Casper, 2013). In terms of business benefits, Ko and his colleagues (2014) categorized it by two concepts, including psychological and behavioral benefits. As the psychological benefits, CSR activities can create enhanced organizational perception (Brown & Dacin, 1997; Ko et al., 2014; Lichtenstein et al., 2004), brand image (Ko et al., 2014), brand loyalty (Walters & Tacon, 2010), corporate reputation (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Walker & Kent, 2009; Walters & Tacon, 2010), competitor differentiation (Walters & Tacon, 2010), consumer satisfaction (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006), employee commitment (Babiak, 2010; Turker, 2009b), and attitudinal loyalty of consumer (Inoue et al., 2015). In addition, the psychological benefits derived from CSR activities can generate behavioral benefits, including financial performance (Breitbarth & Harris, 2008; Fatma et al., 2014; Huang, Yen, Liu, & Huang, 2014; Hur et al., 2014; Walker & Kent, 2009; Walker & Heere, 2011; Walters & Tacon, 2010), word of mouth (Walker & Kent, 2009), merchandise consumption or purchasing behaviors (Walker & Kent, 2009), donation intention (Ko et al., 2014), and behavioral loyalty of consumer (Inoue et al., 2015).
CSR in Sports

Although several studies in CSR have been conducted over at least 50 years in the business literature, the role of CSR in the context of sports has become a significant issue in recent years (Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Breitbarth & Harris, 2008; Kim, 2015; Paramio-Salcines et al., 2013; Trendafilova et al., 2013; Walters & Tacon, 2010). Pharr and Lough (2012) also stated that many scholars have examined CSR in the context of sports since 2000. Numerous sporting organizations have attempted to develop a good relationship with local residents in their communities through socially responsible activities in order to attract them to participate in sporting events as well as to improve social issues or problems (Babiak & Wolfe, 2013; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Walters & Tacon, 2010). Professional sport leagues in North America have also focused on sport philanthropy as a type of socially responsible activity for their communities (Babiak et al., 2012).

In particular, it has been found that the role of socially responsible activities in the context of sports differs from the role of those in other industries in terms of unique features that sport inherently has (Babiak, 2010; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Sheth & Babiak, 2010). Smith and Westerbeek (2007) stated that organizations in both sports and other industries have embraced socially responsible activities for the same reason that fulfills the expectation of society as a member of community, but the nature of sports makes sporting organizations have unique features limited in other industries. For instance, Smith and Westerbeek (2007) utilized key elements expressed by Welford (2005) in order to identify 10 unique features of social responsibility in the context of sports by the following: (1) *rules of fair play: equality, access, diversity*, (2) *safety of participants and spectators*, (3) *independence of playing outcomes*, (4) *transparency of governance*, (5) *pathways for playing*, (6) *community relations policies*, (7)
health and activity foundation, (8) principles of environmental protection and sustainability, (9) developmental focus of participants, and (10) qualified and/or accredited coaching.

After classifying the 10 unique features, Smith and Westerbeek (2007) specifically enumerated seven unique features that sport inherently has while sporting organizations implement socially responsible activities, including (1) mass media distribution and communication power, (2) youth appeal, (3) positive health impacts, (4) social interaction, (5) sustainability awareness, (6) cultural understanding and integration, and (7) immediate gratification benefits. First, mass media distribution and communication power indicated that as sport has become globalized, “sport corporate social responsibility (SCSR) is pervasive and holds significant distributive power” (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007, p. 8). Second, “sport has an inherent appeal to young people, from both a participative and spectator viewpoint” (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007, p. 8). Kim (2015) also stated that “sport has the strong power to appeal to the public, especially young people” (p. 25). Third, sport can have positive health impacts. By participating in sport activities, individuals can improve physical and psychological health. In particular, Taliaferro, Rienzo, Pigg, Miller, and Dodd (2009) demonstrated that college students who participate in physical activities experienced lower rates of hopelessness, depression, and suicidal behaviors than those who do not participate in any physical activities. This is consistent with the research from Smith and Westerbeek (2007) which indicated that participating in sport activities improve psychological well-being, reduce stress, anxiety, and depression, and enhance physical health. In addition, participating in sport activities may contribute to reduce health expenditures (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Fourth, SCSR
encourages social interaction by incorporating with the United Nation (UN) and other international sporting bodies such as the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) and International Olympic Committee (IOC) for stability, democracy, and peace (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Fifth, environmental or sustainability awareness is one of the important issues in SCSR. For instance, as one of the largest international sporting bodies, the IOC has promoted a keen environmental responsibility in its sporting events, including winter and summer Olympic Games (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Sixth, SCSR provides the opportunity for cultural understanding and integration through sporting events such as the opening and closing ceremonies in Olympic Games (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Lastly, “SCSR can offer its participants and organizers fun and satisfaction” (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007, p. 9).

After two years, Babiak and Wolfe (2009) identified four unique elements that major professional leagues have, including (1) passion, (2) economics, (3) transparency, and (4) stakeholder management. First, passion refers to the formative attribute that can be generated by their sport products (e.g., sport games, teams, and athletes) among sport fans or consumers of sport products (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009, 2013). The passion and identification generated by sport products may promote closer community integration (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009, 2013; Wakefield & Wann, 2006; Wilkerson & Dodder, 1987). Second, economics were expressed by Babiak and Wolfe (2013) as a unique element in the sport industry which is limited in other industries such as “monopoly power, the special protections from government via antitrust laws, and the public support for constructing arenas and stadia” (p. 19). Third, transparency indicates that all of the information regarding sport teams (e.g., players, scores, schedules, social responsibility programs, etc.) should be open to the public (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009, 2013). Lastly, stakeholder management refers to the ability of sporting organizations in order to collaborate with
stakeholders such as sport fans, consumers, sponsors, players, government, media, and a local community (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009, 2013).

Numerous scholars (e.g., Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Kim, 2015; Ko et al., 2014; Paramio-Salcines et al., 2013; Pharr & Lough, 2012; Walter & Tacon, 2010) have indicated that socially responsible activities are prominent at the level of the professional sport leagues (e.g., Major League Baseball, National Hockey League, National Football League, National Basketball Association, etc.), the sport product organization (e.g., Adidas, Nike, Under Armour, etc.), the sport team (e.g., Chicago Bulls, LA Dodgers, Florida Marlins, etc.), the individual athlete (e.g., Lance Armstrong, Tiger Woods, etc.), and the major sporting events (e.g., Olympics, World Cup, Super Bowl, etc.) since above parties are influential in our societies in terms of economic and cultural perspectives (Kim, 2015).

Most worldwide professional sport leagues are involved in community outreach programs as a socially responsible activity in order to support social issues or problems in their communities since developing and maintaining a good relationship with a local community is crucial to the success of their leagues (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Inoue et al., 2013; Kim, 2015; Lee, Heinze, Cornwell, & Lu, 2015; Paramio-Salcines et al., 2013). Accordingly, many professional sport leagues have established charitable foundations or departments of social responsibility to increase socially responsible activities such as philanthropic activities through local non-profit organizations (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Inoue et al., 2013; Ko et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2015).

In particular, the professional sport leagues in North America, including Major League Baseball (MLB), National Hockey League (NHL), National Football League
(NFL), and National Basketball Association (NBA) have progressively invested in socially responsible activities to become a socially conscious league (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006, 2009; Godfrey, 2009; Heinze et al., 2014; Inoue et al., 2011). For instance, MLB worked in partnership with the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), known as *MLB Greening Program*, in order to reduce environmental impact by adopting new environmental policies such as using recycled materials, providing information to offset carbon emissions, establishing an eco-committee, etc. (Platt, 2008). MLB utilized a social responsibility program, known as *Reviving Baseball in the Inner City* in order to support social issues or problems (Ko et al., 2014).

Moreover, MLB has partnership with non-profit organizations, such as the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Little League baseball, the National Urban League, and the Jackie Robinson Foundation, for dealing with social issues such as education, health, diversity, etc. in their communities (Babiak, 2010). The NHL has conducted socially responsible activities since the beginning of the league in 1917 (Babiak, 2010). Particularly, the NHL established a social program, *Hockey Fights Cancer*, in 1998 to support cancer institutions, children’s hospital, and player charities (NHL, 2015). According to the NFL (2015), football and community are the twin pillars of the NFL. Thus, the NFL provides cash donation (approximately $10 million) annually to charitable organizations such as the Boys and Girls Clubs of America (Babiak, 2010). The NFL has employed various community programs, including *Youth football, NFL play 60, League initiatives, NFL social responsibility, Player health and safety, and Recognition programs* to support communities (NFL, 2015). Additionally, the NFL cooperates with the American Heart Association, White House, and P&G for NFL play 60 in order to reduce childhood obesity (Lee et al., 2015). Lastly, the NBA has employed a social program, called *NBA Cares*, to enhance worldwide social issues or problems (NBA Cares, 2015). Since implementing NBA Cares in
2005, the NBA along with affiliated teams has raised donations over $260 million, has provided more than 3.3 million hours of social service, and has built over 970 housing units so that poor families can live all over the world (NBA Cares, 2015). Walker and Parent (2010) indicated the NBA has two missions. First, the NBA wants to develop itself as a successful league through socially responsible activities. Second, the NBA uses their strength for social responsibility. Other socially responsible programs that the NBA has conducted to support community are Professional and Life Skills, Personal Development and Education, and Legal Education (Babiak & Wolfe, 2013). Along with a variety of socially responsible activities implemented by professional sport leagues, several partnership organizations provide tangible and intangible resources (e.g., financial support, human resources, knowledge) to professional sport leagues since it may enhance their image or reputation which, in turn, positively influences consumer behaviors such as donations or purchasing intentions (Lee et al., 2015).

Many sport product organizations (e.g., Adidas, Nike) have engaged in socially responsible activities to support social issues or problems globally. As one of the leading sport products organizations, Adidas has engaged in socially responsible projects such as community involvement, employee engagement, and corporate giving (Adidas, 2014). For instance, Adidas developed environmental strategy to protect our environment in 2010. As another major sport product organization, Nike has implemented socially responsible activities. According to the Nike corporate responsibility report (2015), Nike has implemented socially responsible activities in various areas such as workers/factories, environment, communities, and people/culture. For instance, Nike constantly innovates itself to conserve water, to increase energy efficiency, and to recycle products in order to
protect our environment. In addition, Nike has provided funds, in-kind contribution, and other corporate resources to communities around the world.

While CSR is a growing concern among professional sport leagues, the sport teams also have their own community outreach programs in order to make a positive relationship with their local communities (Ko et al., 2014). Babiak and Wolfe (2009) stated that most professional sport teams have charitable foundations to support the communities. This is because the sport teams can maintain or increase the number of sport spectators by implementing socially responsible activities (Walters & Tacon, 2010). In particular, many sport teams have engaged in philanthropic and community services to support social issues or problems (Paramio-Salcines et al., 2013). For example, the Chicago Bulls has created a non-profit organization, known as CharitaBulls, to improve the quality of life for children living in Chicago and to support youth education since 1987. The name was recently changed to Chicago Bulls Charities which focuses more on youth education, health, and eradication of violence (Chicago Bulls, 2015). The Phoenix Suns also created a socially responsible program, Phoenix Suns Charities, with the mission to support poor families in Arizona (Phoenix Suns, 2015). As one of the MLB teams, the Florida Marlins has operated various socially responsible programs, including Beyond the Ballpark, View Our Blue Book, Marlins Think Tank, Player Involvement, Marlins Ayudan, Our Charity Partners, Our Youth Baseball Service, Receive a Gift, and Give a Gift. Particularly, the Florida Marlins provided cash donation to four non-profit organizations, including Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Miami, Special Olympics Florida – Miami-Dade, Up2Us Sports, and Young At Art Museum in 2015 (Florida Marlins, 2015).

Professional sport teams have utilized their athletes as valuable assets by participating in team’s community outreach programs (Tainsky & Babiak, 2011). The trend of supporting society
by athletes dates back to 1994 (Babiak et al., 2012; Tainsky & Babiak, 2011). Babiak et al. (2012) also indicated that professional sport teams have utilized their athletes for sport philanthropy or charitable activities to demonstrate their involvement in good deeds since they can develop a positive image of the team. While many athletes in professional sport teams have participated in various social activities, individual athletes have also engaged in social activities by setting up their own charitable foundations (Ko et al., 2014). For example, former tennis star player, Andre Agassi, found Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy in 2001 to provide an excellent education for children (Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy, 2015). Lance Armstrong established LIVESTRONG in 1997 to support people affected by cancer (LIVESTRONG, 2015). The Tiger Woods Foundation was established in 1996 by Tiger Woods and his father, Earl Woods, to support community-based programs (e.g., Tiger Woods Learning center and Earl Woods scholarship program) that improve health, education, and welfare for low-income students in the United States (Tiger Woods Foundation, 2015). These three are the biggest foundations established by individual athletes in terms of donations and assets in the United States (Babiak et al, 2012).

Over the past decades, several countries have made a bid to host mega sporting events such as the Olympics and World Cup because the country or the city hosting these events may receive a variety of benefits, including, but not limited to, improving infrastructure, increasing job opportunity, enhancing country or city image, growing tourism industry, making economic development, and expanding investment (Ahmen, 1991; Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Hiller, 2006; Kim & Walker, 2012; Smith, 2005; Walker et al., 2013). In addition, the countries gain pride and prestige by hosting those sporting
events (Tien, Lo, & Lin, 2011). As the event owners of the Olympics and World Cup, the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) have implemented socially responsible activities through their sporting events to make a positive impact on society all over the world (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Paramio-Salcines et al., 2013). For example, since establishing a CSR department in 2005, FIFA has built a good relationship with society by conducting numerous socially responsible programs and campaigns (e.g., My Game is Fair Play, Say No to Racism, 20 Centres for 2010, Football for the Planet, and Football for Hope) to achieve social development (FIFA, 2015). FIFA stated that the World Cup is not just a soccer game, but it is a world peace festival. In particular, FIFA established a socially responsible program Win in Africa, With Africa for the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa, that is a developing country with poverty, health, and safety issues in order to enhance the image of a sporting event as well as to support social problems through a soccer game in not only South Africa but also the African Continent (Walker et al., 2013). Football for hope programs is designed to support education and public health in developing countries (Waddington et al., 2013). IOC has also conducted socially responsible programs such as Olympic Solidarity not only to support athletes in developing countries but also to promote Olympic ideals (Kim, 2013). According to IOC (2015a), there are six Olympism in action associated to CSR, including Sport for All, Peace through Sport, Development through Sport, Women in Sport, Education through Sport, and Sport and environment. In addition, IOC cooperates with the UN to develop a better and more peaceful world through sports. For example, IOC and the UN worked together to rebuild sporting infrastructure in Haiti damaged by terrible earthquake (IOC, 2015b). Lastly, the Super Bowl is one of the biggest sporting events in the United States (Kim & Walker, 2012; Matheson & Baade, 2006). The Super Bowl is considered
economic and developmental catalysts since it has been paid a great deal of attention from the public and media (Kim & Walker, 2012). Babiak and Wolfe (2006) also stated that the Super Bowl creates not only the highest viewing ratings but also the highest revenue among sporting events. As the event owner of the Super Bowl, the NFL has developed outreach programs with organizations located in the hosting city to support social issues such as health, education, and racism in order to build a positive image and reputation by reducing criticism (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Ko et al., 2014).

CSR in Collegiate Sports

Collegiate athletic departments have received revenues along with the growing popularity of collegiate sports in the United States (Schlereth, Scott, & Berman, 2014). According to NCAA (2015), the ticket sales for NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), including 108 public and 17 private institutions was the second largest income source after cash contributions from alumni and others. The ticket sales accounted for approximately 25% (with median values of $9,155,000) of the generated revenues while contributions from alumni and others accounted for approximately 26% (with median values of $9,850,000) of the generated revenues (NCAA, 2015). Schlereth et al (2014) indicated The University of Texas at Austin is the top revenue generating collegiate athletic department with total revenue of $165,691,486 based on the 2014 USA Today College Sports Revenues Database. Therefore, many collegiate athletic departments in the United States currently operate a variety of socially responsible activities in order to develop a positive image or reputation among students, faculty, staff, alumni, and local residents (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006, 2009; Ko et al., 2014; Trendafilova
et al., 2013; Walker & Kent, 2009). It is consistent with the research from Ko and his colleagues (2014) which indicated that many collegiate athletic departments have utilized CSR activities in order to build a positive image or reputation among stakeholders, particularly college athletic donors, since donations are one of the important income sources for a college or a collegiate athletic department.

Multiple levels of socially responsible activities, including the national level, the conference level, and the institutional level have been involved in collegiate athletics (Brown, 2012; Ko et al., 2014). As the national level, the NCAA has a socially responsible program, known as *Achieving Coaches Excellence Program* in order to support collegiate minority coaches for providing racial and ethnic diversity in the field of collegiate sports (Dent, 2015; Ko et al., 2014). The NCAA selects the most talented coaches, and then provides them educational programs relevant to leadership, communication, community involvement, and program management. The NCAA also provides an opportunity for their coaches to interact with current NCAA coaches and athletic directors (NCAA, 2012). As an example of the conference level, the Southeastern Conference (SEC) is recognized as the best conference in community service (Schlereth et al., 2014). SCE has hosted youth clinics every year with corporate sponsors in order to educate local children (SEC, 2015). Schlereth et al. (2014) reported student-athletes in SEC participate in community service with average of 2,500 hours for the academic year. Ko et al. (2014) also stated that the Mid – America Intercollegiate Athletics Association (MIAA) provides various philanthropic activities (e.g., food drives) to local communities. As the institutional level, student-athletes, coaches, and staff in many colleges or universities have voluntarily participated in socially responsible activities, such as summer programs and food drives, to support hungry people as well as to educate youth in their local communities (Ko et al., 2014). Schlereth et al.
(2014) also indicated that community service is a general approach of socially responsible activities among sport organizations. In particular, a student services department within a collegiate athletic department plays an integral part in community relations by creating the social activity programs in order to provide the outreach to the community (Jordan & Denson, 1990; Schlereth et al., 2014). For instance, over 40 student-athletes, coaches, and staff at the University of Arkansas helped feed the hungry in cooperation with local non-profit and profit organizations, including Northwest Arkansas Food Bank and Tyson Food, Inc. in the Northwest Arkansas area (Razorback Communications, 2015). Football players and coaches at the University of Tennessee have annually held the special event, TeamSmile, in order to provide free dental care for children in the Knoxville area (Tennessee Athletics, 2015).

In addition to their socially responsible activities, environmental programs (e.g., recycling efforts and operating energy efficient facilities) in NCAA member institutions were undertaken by collegiate athletic departments (Trendafilova et al., 2013). Schlereth et al. (2014) also stated that environmental sustainability is one of the CSR behaviors among sport organizations. Although recycling efforts is small component of the environmental sustainability landscape, many collegiate athletic departments have participated in the program (Schlereth et al., 2014). For instance, the University of Tennessee has implemented an environmental program since 1993 in order to promote recycling in all of the sporting events on campus. Florida State University and Pennsylvania State University have implemented a recycling program during their football games (Trendafilova et al., 2013).
Theoretical Approaches to CSR

Over the past decades, many scholars have applied various theories, including stakeholder theory (Brown, 2012; Forester, 2009; Jamali, 2008; Kim, 2009; Kim, 2015; Ko et al., 2014; Pirsch et al., 2007; Polite et al., 2011), social identity theory (Ko et al., 2014; Lee, 2009), social exchange theory (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, & Ganapathi, 2007; Hwang, 2015; Kim, Kim, & Kim, 2014; Ko et al., 2014; Shiau & Luo, 2012), and instrumental theory (Forester, 2009; Ko et al., 2014) to best describe the concept of CSR. Accordingly, it is difficult to get the most suitable theory to elucidate the concept of CSR (Forester, 2009).

First, several scholars (e.g., Forester, 2009; Freeman, 1984; Kok, Wiele, McKenna, & Brown, 2001; Kim, 2009; Kim, 2015; Pirsch et al., 2007; Polite et al., 2011) have utilized stakeholder theory to explain the phenomenon of CSR. In addition, stakeholder theory was considered the most powerful and suitable theory to describe the phenomenon of CSR (Stark, 1993). Stakeholder theory was introduced by Freeman (1984) as stakeholder management which indicated that corporate organizations should have an ability to manage or control their stakeholder groups for the survival or the success in the business world. While actual stakeholders are considered main components of the business (Forester, 2009), Freeman (1984) defined stakeholder as “a group or individual who can affect or be affected by the actions or performance of the objectives of the firm” (p. 46). Stakeholder theory suggests that “organizational survival and success is contingent on satisfying both its economic (e.g., profit maximization) and non-economic (e.g., corporate social performance) objectives by meeting the needs of the company’s various stakeholders” (Pirsch et al., 2007, p. 127). Based upon a framework of stakeholder theory, corporate organizations should have responsibility for stakeholders as well as for other groups or individuals in society (Kim, 2009). This is because the
decision of corporate organizations can be influenced by social issues, and stakeholders expect their organizations to support social issues (Kok et al., 2001; Kim, 2009). For the above reasons, the phenomenon of CSR can be better understood based on a framework of stakeholder theory.

Second, social identity theory is useful in understanding of the effect of socially responsible activities (Ko et al., 2014). In general, social identity theory is expressed as an individual’s sense of who they are associated with a social group. Tajfel (1981) defined social identity as a part of an individual’s self-concept derived from a perceived membership of a social group with value and emotional significance. Based upon this theory, an individual (e.g., employee and consumers) may perceive positive self-concept once he or she belongs to a certain organization highly involved in CSR activities as a corporate citizen. This phenomenon may lead to an increase of employee commitment as well as consumer’s purchasing intention (Ko et al., 2014; Lee, 2009).

Third, social exchange theory is defined as “exchange of activity, tangible or intangible, and more or less rewarding or costly, between at least two persons” (Homans, 1961, p. 13). Basically, the concept of social exchange theory is one of mutual benefit for both parties. Shiau and Luo (2012) expressed social exchange theory as the interaction between individuals and corporate organizations in order to maximize benefits and to minimize costs. Based upon this theory, collegiate athletic departments’ socially responsible activities might influence sport consumers’ conative loyalty (i.e., attending future games, purchasing the team’s merchandise, buy team name clothing, and supporting team) since sport consumers seek benefits from collegiate athletic departments (Hwang, 2015).
Lastly, instrumental theory is expressed as “the theory in which the corporation is viewed only as a means to create profits and wealth with its social activities only implemented to help achieve those results” (Forester, 2009, p. 22). Instrumental theory is based on the idea that corporate organizations achieve economic objectives through their socially responsible activities (Ko et al., 2014). In this sense, corporate organizations support their community by implementing socially responsible activities for the reason of maximizing profits, and socially responsible activities are considered as an instrument of creating wealth (Garriga & Melé, 2004). In addition, some scholars (e.g., Garriga & Melé, 2004; Jeong, 2011; Kim et al., 2014) have applied integrative theory, impression management theory, political theories, and ethical theory to explain the phenomenon of CSR.

Based upon the above theories, this study utilized social exchange theory as a foundation of the study in order to describe the mutual benefit between sport consumers and sporting organizations. For instance, sport consumers have tangible (e.g., having educational support) or intangible (e.g., feeling good) benefits from socially responsible activities conducted by a collegiate athletic department. Through those social activities, the collegiate athletic department also enjoys the benefits such as increased level of customer satisfaction and a positive customer evaluation which, in turn, generate revenues for the department since sport consumers who experienced the benefits from social activities of a sporting organization are more likely to attend sporting events, purchase the teams’ merchandise, and support the team (Brown & Dacin, 1997; Kim et al., 2010).
Involvement

Numerous researchers (e.g., Armstrong, 2002; Beaton et al., 2011; Celuch & Taylor, 1999; Dwyer, 2011; Kim, 2003; Ko et al., 2010; Laurent & Kapferer, 1985; Laverie & Arnett, 2000; Shank & Beasley, 1998; Shapiro & Ridinger, 2011; Zaichkowsky, 1985, 1994) have examined the concept and theories of involvement in order to understand consumer behavior since the book, *The psychology of ego involvements: social attitudes and identifications*, was introduced by Sherif and Cantril in 1947, and the book has been considered an initial work in this subject. The concept of involvement has been explained as the psychological connection of an individual with objects such as particular products or services (Kunkel et al., 2013; Zaichkowsky, 1985). In particular, the level of involvement (e.g., high and low involvement) has received immense attention by many scholars (e.g., Armstrong, 2002; Beaton et al., 2011; Kim, 2003; Shapiro & Ridinger, 2011) in the fields of marketing, advertising, and leisure studies since consumer’s behavior patterns can be determined based on the level of involvement. Ko et al. (2010) also identified the level of involvement can be determined by the degree of individual relevance or importance toward the products or services. Accordingly, an individual, highly involved in a particular product due to his or her personal relevance or importance toward it, is more likely to purchase the products or services than an individual less involved in the products or services (Kim, 2003; Laurent & Kapferer, 1985). Therefore, the construct of involvement is one of the key components for the success of corporate organizations since understanding the concept of involvement can build a positive reputation as well as maximize revenue for the organizations (Beaton et al., 2011).
The Definition of Involvement

Over the past several decades, the definition of involvement has been discussed by several scholars (e.g., Bloch, 1982; Havitz, Dimanche, & Bogel, 1994; Stone, 1984; Zaichkowsky, 1985). For instance, Bloch (1982) defined involvement as “an unobservable state reflecting the amount of interest, arousal, or emotional attachment evoked by the product in a particular individual” (p. 413). Zaichkowsky (1985) defined involvement as “a person’s perceived relevance of the object based on inherent needs, values, and interests” (p. 342). It is also defined as “an unobservable state of motivation, arousal, or interest that is evoked by a particular stimulus or situation and has driven properties” (Havitz et al., 1994, p. 39). Based on the aforementioned definitions, the concept of involvement has been generally explained as a psychological aspect consumers have toward a particular object, and it is generated by a particular stimulus such as socially responsible activities (Bennett, Ferreira, Lee, & Polite, 2009; Kunkel et al., 2013; Zaichkowsky, 1985). However, Stone (1984) suggested that not only psychological involvement but also behavioral involvement should be utilized in understanding the phenomena of consumer behavior since he explained involvement in behavioral aspects as “time and/or intensity of effort expended in the undertaking of behaviors” (p. 210). Moreover, Laverie and Arnett (2000) explained involvement as two different concepts, such as enduring and situational involvement in the business literature. Enduring involvement refers to “the ongoing baseline level of concern with an activity or product,” while situational involvement refers to “the passing increase in concern for the activity or product due to temporary circumstances” (Laverie & Arnett, 2000, p. 231).
Level of Involvement

The majority of research in the field of marketing, advertising, and leisure studies has primarily focused on the level of involvement (e.g., high and low involvement) that consumers have associated with certain products or services since the level of involvement influences consumer’s attitudes and behavior pattern (Armstrong, 2002; Beaton et al., 2011; Dwyer, 2011; Kim, 2003; Kunkel et al., 2013; Shapiro & Ridinger, 2011). For example, an individual who is highly involved in particular products or services is more likely to purchase or consume the products or services. This parallels the finding from Laurent and Kapferer (1985) which indicated that consumers differ greatly in terms of the extent of the searching process and decision making process based upon the degree of involvement. In addition, it can be assumed that those consumers who are highly involved with certain products or services, in turn, become loyal consumers for corporate organizations. According to Petty and Cacioppo (1984), the level of involvement is changed by the persuasion processes such as central and peripheral routes. Central route indicates that “people use more cognitive efforts to process persuasive processes to occur when involvement is high” and peripheral route indicates that “people depend more on affective cues to evaluate persuasive information when involvement is low” (Lee, 2010, p. 34). In other words, consumers enhance the persuasion process by receiving cognitive efforts (e.g., receiving marketing messages and advertising) when involvement is high. The persuasion process, in turn, changes consumer’s attitude toward the products or services. On the other hand, Zaichkowsky (1985) proposed that the level of involvement is determined by three characteristics such as personal, physical, and situational. First, personal characteristic indicates the level of involvement can be changed by personal characteristics: interests, values, and needs. Second, product differentiation is developed by physical characteristics of a certain product. The
differentiation of the product leads consumers to increase interest in the product. Lastly, situational characteristics refer to something that temporarily changes interests, values, and needs of a product (Zaichkowsky, 1985). Several involvement studies to date have supported that the aforementioned characteristics influence the level of involvement, advertisement, consumer behavior, and purchasing intentions (Shapiro & Ridinger, 2011; Zaichkowsky, 1985).

**Sport Involvement**

Hill and Green (2000) defined sport involvement as “the perceived importance of the sports to the consumer” (p. 147). Selin and Howard (1988) defined involvement in the leisure studies as “the state of identification existing between an individual and a recreational activity, at one point in time, characterized by some level of enjoyment and self-expression being achieved through the activity” (p. 237). Sport involvement is also defined as “the perceived interest in and personal importance of sports to an individual” (Shank & Beasley, 1998, p. 436). Based upon the definitions, sport involvement is one of the important psychological constructs in order to identify why sport consumers attend sporting events, why they participate in sport activities, or why they purchase sport-related merchandises (Armstrong, 2002; Celuch & Taylor, 1999). It is also supported by the research from Lee (2010) which indicated that involvement is “imperative variable in understanding and predicting consumer behavior” (p. 34). This is because sport involvement not only predicts various aspects of sport consumer behavior but also establishes motivation that generates actual sport consumptions such as attending sporting events, participating in sports, and purchasing sport-related merchandises (Dwyer, 2011; Iwasaki & Havitz, 2004; Kim, 2015; Lascu, Giese, Toolan, Guehring, & Mercer, 1995). In particular, Lascu et al. (1995) specified that sport consumers with a high level of involvement tend to attend, play,
and watch more sporting events as well as to identify sponsors of sporting events more correctly than sport consumers with a low level of involvement. This finding suggests how the concept of involvement is utilized for sport marketers in order to understand sport consumer behavior. Accordingly, understanding of the concept of sport involvement as a psychological construct may be a fundamental component for the success of sporting organizations. Recently, Kunkel et al. (2013) identified sport involvement as “the degree to which individuals evaluate their connection with the sport object based on whether the sport object provides hedonic and symbolic values and is central to their life” (p. 178). Sport consumers have a hedonic value through sport products in terms of having pleasure when participating in sport activities, and they also feel a symbolic value generated from differentiation compared with other groups while purchasing their favorite team’s merchandise or consuming favorite sport activities (Kerstetter & Kovich, 1997).

**Consumer Behavior**

Engel, Kollat, and Blackwell (1973) defined consumer behavior as “the acts of individual directly involved in obtaining and using economic goods and services, including the decision processes that precede and determine those acts” (p. 5). Consumer behavior in the field of sport management is defined as “a process that involves the individuals when they select, buy, use, and have products and services related with sport to satisfy their needs” (Fernandes et al., 2013, p. 3). Accordingly, previous literature in consumer behavior is mainly focused on the motivations why sport consumers attend sporting events, why they participate in sport activities, or why they purchase sport-related merchandise (Armstrong, 2002; Celuch & Taylor, 1999; Fernandes et al.,
The concept of involvement has been used among many researchers to advance the understanding of consumer behavior (Kim, 2003; Laurent & Kapferer, 1985; Rothchild, 1984; Shapiro & Ridinger, 2011; Zaichkowsky, 1985). Understanding the concept of consumer behavior is one of the important elements for the success of business (Kim, 2003) since it provides myriad of benefits for organizations, including “assisting managers in their decision making, providing marketing researchers with a theoretical base from which to analyze consumers, helping legislators and regulators create laws and regulations, and assisting the average consumer in making better purchase decisions” (Mowen, 1990, p. 9). In addition, consumer behavior tends to be changed by different circumstances or various factors (Kim, 2003; Witt, 1970). Thus, managers or marketers in corporate organizations should carefully examine consumer behaviors with different product categories under different circumstances for the success of business (Kim, 2003).

**Sport Consumers**

Unlike general consumers, sport consumers (e.g., sport fans, sport spectator, and sport participants) are a unique group of individuals in terms of having psychological attachment to sport objects, including particular teams, sports, or sport players/coaches (Kunkel et al., 2013; Shank & Beasley, 1998; Zetou, Kouli, Psarras, Tzetzis, & Michalopoulou, 2013). Kim (2015) defined sport consumers as “those people who are interested in or attracted to the consumption activity of sport” (P. 15), and it has been categorized by two parts, including a sport spectator and a sport participant (Milne & McDonald, 1999). Sport spectators can be identified as people who attend sporting events, watching or listening to sport games, and reading sport magazines.
while sport participants can be identified as people who participate in physical activities (Kim, 2015).

**Commitment**

Commitment is defined as “an internal psychological state of mind an individual has toward an object” (Heere & Dickson, 2008, p. 230). To date, the concept of commitment has been paid a great deal of attention by several scholars in multiple research settings, including business organizations (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Brammer, Millington, & Rayton, 2007; Turker, 2009b), sports (Bee & Havitz, 2010; Heere & Dickson, 2008; Scanlan et al., 1993; Tachis & Tzetzis, 2015), and leisure studies (Iwasaki & Havitz, 1998, 2004). Commitment in business organizations is considered as psychological identification an employee has toward his or her organization (Turker, 2009b). Thus, it is important to identify how employee’s commitment toward the organization is developed for managers because it can increase job performance, employee retention, and employee physical and psychological health (Brammer et al., 2007; Ko et al., 2014; Tachis & Tzetzis, 2015). As an example, Brammer et al., (2007) investigated the relationship between employee perception of CSR and organizational commitment, and found that employees have a high level of commitment toward their organization when they perceive the organization’s social activities for the community. Turker (2009b) also identified that CSR activities significantly influenced employees’ organizational commitment when they recognize their organization do good social activities for the society. Allen and Meyer (1996) explained commitment as a psychological link between employee and his or her organization. They called it as organizational commitment, and categorized it into three concepts, including affective, continuance, and normative commitment. According to Allen and Meyer (1996), affective
commitment refers to emotional attachment an employee has to the organization; continuance commitment refers to costs associated with leaving the organizations; and normative commitment indicates the sense of obligation an employee has to the organization.

**Sport Commitment**

Fernandes et al. (2013) defined sport commitment as “a psychological state representing the desire to continue to participate in a particular sport program or sport in general” (p. 3). Sousa, Torregrosa, Viladrich, Villamarín, and Cruz (2007) also defined sport commitment as a psychological construct to explain the motivation of continued participating in sport. Based upon the definitions, sport consumers with a high level of commitment are more likely to continue to participate in or attend sport activities, support his or her favorite teams regardless of team performance, and purchase his or her favorite teams’ merchandises (Fernandes et al., 2013).

Commitment plays a significant role in predicting consumer behavior (e.g., loyalty). In particular, the concept of commitment is pivotal in order to create a loyal fan base (Fernandes et al., 2013; Weiss & Weiss, 2006). This is because the concept of commitment represents resistance to change (Fernandes et al., 2013). Heere and Dickson (2008) also indicated creating a loyal fan base is critical due to “heterogeneous nature of the service provided and the organization’s dependence on the team’s performance” (p. 227). For instance, the Major League Baseball teams, Boston Red Sox and the Chicago Cubs still have many home game attendances in the absence of team performance by managing a loyal fan base (Heere, & Dickson, 2008; Matsuoka, 2001).

However, some psychological constructs in the field of sport management are conceptually confused and overlapped (Heere & Dickson, 2008). In particular, various psychological terms (e.g., identification, attachment, attraction, association, involvement,
commitment, and loyalty) have been advanced in order to explain the connection of sport consumers to their favorite sports, sport teams, and sport players/coaches (Funk & James, 2001). For instance, Wann and Pierce (2003) compared the scale of team identification and sport commitment, and found that the two scales were highly correlated. In addition, several scholars have used the attitudinal constructs of commitment and attitudinal loyalty interchangeably (Mahony, Madrigal, & Howard, 2000; Tachis & Tzetzis, 2015). For instance, Mahony et al. (2000, p. 17) asserted that “psychological commitment best describes the attitude component of loyalty.” However, some scholars have a different view in the meaning of the terms, commitment and loyalty. For example, Heere and Dickson (2008, p. 230) stated that “loyalty is best considered the individual’s resistance to change the strength of commitment rather than commitment itself.” They also defined commitment as “an internal psychological state of mind an individual has toward and object” and loyalty as “the result of the interaction between negative external changes and the internal psychological connection” (p. 230). Based on Heere and Dickson’s (2008) argument, the study utilized the term of commitment as an antecedent in developing conative loyalty.

Loyalty

Oliver (1997) defined customer loyalty as “a deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronize a preferred product/service provide consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing” (p. 196). It is also defined as “a customer’s sense of belonging or identification with the employees, services or products of a company” (Cheng, 2011, p. 150). This sense of belonging or identification directly influences customer
behavior such as repurchase intention and word of mouth (Cheng, 2011; Jones & Sasser, 1995). The concept of loyalty has become essential in business organizations for achieving their goals such as increasing revenues, developing a reputation, enhancing community development, and improving the quality of life (Bowen & Chen, 2001; Cheng, 2011; Iwasaki & Havitz, 2004; Reynolds & Arnold, 2000). Tachis and Tzetzis (2015) also stated that consumer loyalty is an important construct in the business literature for consumer retention. Accordingly, many corporate organizations have focused on growing and retaining their customers in order to survivor in today’s competitive business environment (Han et al., 2011). This is because loyal consumers are more likely to purchase products or services and less likely to switch to alternatives due to other influential factors such as increased price than non-loyal consumers (Bowen & Chen, 2001). Han et al. (2011) also stated that when individuals become loyal customers, they are more likely to purchase the products or services, pay more premium prices, and recommend more to their family and friends. Fornell and Wernerfelt (1987) also noted that new customer acquisition is more costly than customer retention. Therefore, it is important to make a good relationship with loyal customer by fulfilling their needs and wants for the success of business (Han et al., 2011).

**Attitudinal and Behavioral loyalty**

In general, the construct of loyalty is comprised of attitudinal and behavioral loyalty (Cheng, 2011; Han et al., 2011; Inoue et al., 2015). Attitudinal loyalty means “consumers’ sense of specific products or service” while behavioral loyalty means “consumers’ repurchase behavioral or intension of specific brand” (Cheng, 2011, p. 151). Tsiotsou (2013, p. 459) also stated that attitudinal loyalty is “the level of commitment of the consumer toward a
product/brand” while behavioral loyalty refers to “consumers’ overt behavior toward a specific product/brand in relation to a repeated purchasing behavior”. Early studies in customer loyalty primarily focused on behavioral aspects such as repeat purchase or frequency rather than an attitudinal aspect of customer loyalty (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003; Han et al., 2011; Tellis, 1988). However, numerous researchers stressed that both attitudinal and behavioral aspects are equally important components for the success of business (Bove, Pervan, Beatty, & Shiu, 2009; Cheng, 2011; Fullerton, 2005; Kumar, Shah, & Venkatesan, 2006; Lam, Shankar, Erramilli, & Murthy, 2004; Oliver, 1999). This is because only one aspect (e.g., attitudinal or behavioral loyalty) is not sufficient to measure true loyalty precisely (Evanschitzky & Wunderlich, 2006; Han et al., 2011; Oliver, 1997). For instance, it is difficult to say that consumers who frequently purchase a certain product always have a positive attitude toward the product or brand. Inversely, the attitudinal loyalty does not always lead consumers to purchase a certain product.

Four Stages of Loyalty

Many scholars have examined the four-stage loyalty model in order to identify cognitive, affective, conative, and action loyalty in the last decade (Back & Parks, 2003; Evanschitzky & Wunderlich, 2006; Han et al., 2011). According to Oliver’s (1997) framework, loyalty is comprised of four stages, including cognitive, affective, conative, and action loyalty. Thus, the level of loyalty is increased by these four stages in sequence (Oliver, 1999). First, cognitive loyalty leads consumers to consider preferred products and alternatives based on their previous knowledge or experience-based information (Han et al., 2011; Oliver, 1999; Trail et al., 2005). Second, affective loyalty is developed by consumers’ positive attitude toward products, brand, or satisfaction from their
experiences (Han et al., 2011; Oliver, 1999; Trail et al., 2005). Third, conative loyalty is defined as “an intention or commitment to behave toward a goal in a particular manner” (Oliver, 1997, p. 393). In other words, conative loyalty indicates the notion of behavioral intention (Choi, Lu, & Cai, 2015; Oliver, 1999; Trail et al., 2005). Accordingly, this study utilized the concept of conative loyalty to measure sport consumers’ intentions, including attending future games, purchasing the team’s merchandise, buying team clothing, and supporting a team since conative loyalty is considered a significant predictor of actual behavior (Choi et al., 2015). Additionally, since the gap between intentions and actual behaviors has not been addressed in most empirical studies, measuring conative loyalty is more an appropriate method than measuring behavioral intention in order to identify actual consumption (Choi et al., 2015). This is also supported by the research conducted by Kim, Byon, Yu, Zhang, and Kim (2013) which indicated that since measuring action loyalty is virtually impossible, “conative loyalty is regarded as an alternative method to assess customer purchase behavior” (p. 1363). Finally, action loyalty is the last stage of loyalty where intentions are converted to actions (Oliver, 1999).

**Summary**

As discussed in this chapter, CSR is one of the important constructs in order to strengthen the relationship between stakeholders (e.g., investors, consumers, employees, and governments) and organizations (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Bhattacharya et al., 2009; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Du et al., 2007; Margolis & Walsh, 2003; Pirsch et al., 2007; Ramasamy & Ting, 2004; Ross et al., 1991). Thus, many organizations utilize socially responsible activities (e.g., corporate philanthropy, cause-related marketing, employee volunteerism, charity donations, and innovative programs) as an effective means in order to have a good relationship with stakeholders.
Moreover, CSR provides various benefits for organizations, including obtaining favorable consumer awareness, attitudes, and a sense of attachment, improving consumer satisfaction, enhancing financial performance, and creating positive consumer’ behavioral outcomes (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Brown & Dacin, 1997; Hur et al., 2014; Ko et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2012; Walker & Kent, 2009; Walker & Heere, 2011). Accordingly, organizations need to develop well-planned social activities by identifying what social issues or problems have existed in their communities (Ko et al., 2014). In addition, it is important to identify psychological constructs (e.g., involvement and commitment) consumers have toward their favorite organizations in order to leverage the benefits (e.g., consumer loyalty) of the social activities for organizations. This chapter, therefore, identified the general concept of sport involvement and commitment that mediate the relationship between sport consumer’s awareness of social activities conducted by a collegiate athletic department and their conative loyalty.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the theoretical relationship among variables, including college sport consumers’ awareness in regard to socially responsible activities of a collegiate athletic department, sport involvement, commitment, and conative loyalty. This chapter delineates the methodology used in this study, including the research design, participants, data collection procedure, instruments, and data analysis.

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative research method (e.g., survey research) in order to collect data from college sport consumers at a certain university in the United States. Survey research is commonly used in the field of sport management and other disciplines for its ability to collect data from a large number of people within an intended target population (Inoue, 2011). Inoue (2011) explained two additional benefits of using a quantitative research method. First, survey participants fill out the same set of questionnaires which may improve reliability. Second, the survey is anonymous which may elicit more thoughtful responses from participants without a time limit. In addition, survey research could explain the differences of individual’s knowledge, attitude, and behavior (Fink, 2003). Compared with traditional survey methods (e.g., mail, paper, phone, interview, etc.), an online survey is relatively useful due to its low cost and fast response rates (Ilieva, Baron, & Healey, 2002). In addition, an online survey would allow survey participants to take a survey anytime and anywhere via an online channel (Wright, 2005). Since this survey is voluntary, participants could choose whether to complete the questionnaire or not anytime throughout the participation.
Participants

A convenience sample of undergraduate and graduate students over 18 years of age participated in this study at a major public university in the southeastern region of the United States. Specifically, the study used a convenience sampling method in order to collect data from the University of Arkansas since the concept of college sport consumer is extensive; in addition collecting data from the population across the nation is difficult (Hwang, 2015). Kandola, Banner, O’Keefe-McCarthy, and Jassal (2014) explained the convenience sampling as the method that a researcher would select participants from a population in a non-random manner for their convenience (e.g., availability or accessibility of participants). A total of 385 college students enrolled in eight courses under three different colleges, including the College of Education and Health Professions, the Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences, and J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences at the university, participated in the online survey through an email with a link to a Qualtrics page. The students majored in diverse disciplines, including Recreation and Sport Management, Apparel Merchandising and Product Development, Engineering, Political Science, Journalism, Management, Chemistry, Marketing, Biology, Kinesiology, Elementary Education, Criminal Justice, and Animal Science.

In structural equation modeling (SEM), determining requisite sample size is often controversial and challenging among researchers (Iacobucci, 2010; Wolf, Harrington, Clark, & Miller, 2013). This is because model characteristics such as sample size influence the accuracy of the parameter estimate as well as model fit indices (MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999). Therefore, researchers should consider adequate sample size in order to achieve desirable empirical outcomes, such as adequate statistical power, model convergence, and statistical precision (Myers, Ahn, & Jin, 2011; Wolf et al., 2013). In addition, a requisite sample size is
required to get unbiased results (Inoue, 2011). For instance, Wetson and Gore (2006) asserted that sample size of at least 200 is necessary to employ SEM. Hinkin (1995) also suggested a minimum sample size calculated by multiplying the number of items in the measurement model by four should be needed in order to employ SEM. However, these rules are conservative, and it may be problematic since it does not explain the effect of model complexity or model specifics (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006; Iacobucci, Saldanha, & Deng, 2007; Wolf et al., 2013). By considering the level of model complexity, this study utilized the suggestion proposed by Bentler and Chou (1987) that indicated 10 observations per freely estimated parameters. Since the original measurement model consists of 27 freely estimated parameters, a minimum of 270 observations were required to conduct SEM.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to use human subjects was obtained from the University of Arkansas (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was distributed via the online website Qualtrics, and participants were asked to complete the survey through email with the link. The consent form, including the purpose of study, potential risks, and contact information, was given to participants in order to better understand this study. Data collection was conducted from the beginning of March to the end of April in 2017.

**Instruments**

At the beginning of the survey, three screening questions were asked of the potential respondents: (1) Are you familiar with the Arkansas Razorbacks?; (2) Have you previously watched sporting events, attended sporting events, purchased sport-related merchandises, or
participated in sport activities?; (3) Are you an Arkansas student-athlete?. The screening questions served three purposes. First, the researcher wanted to ensure that only those respondents who were familiar with the Arkansas Razorbacks were captured thereby eliminating any potentially biased and unfamiliar responses. Second, the second question was intended to capture those respondents who were sport consumers since a sport consumer is defined as an individual who is attracted to the consumption activities of the sports, including attending or watching sporting events, purchasing sport-related products, and participating in sport activities in this study. Third, the last question was intended to classify two groups, including student-athlete and non-athlete. Since student-athletes are provided with sporting goods (e.g., uniform, equipment) from the university, the responses regarding conative loyalty (e.g., purchasing the Arkansas Razorbacks clothing or merchandise) would be potentially biased.

The questionnaire used for the current study consisted of five sections (e.g., demographic factors, awareness of CSR, sport involvement, commitment, and conative loyalty) with a total of 29 items (see Appendix B for the full version of the instrument). Among 29 items, 25 items were adopted and modified from existing scales to measure awareness of CSR, sport involvement, commitment, and conative loyalty. Demographic questions such as gender, race/ethnicity, age, and grade were included at the beginning of the questionnaire.

**Awareness of CSR.** Four items of awareness of CSR were adopted and modified from the study conducted by Walker and Heere (2011). Statements used to measure awareness of CSR were: (1) I am aware of the social programs of the Arkansas Razorbacks; (2) I know of the good things the Arkansas Razorbacks do for the community; (3) I am aware of the programs of the Arkansas Razorbacks that benefit the community; (4) I believe the Arkansas Razorbacks to be a socially responsible organization. Scale items were measured by 7-point Likert type scale
anchored by 1 as strongly disagree to 7 as strongly agree. Walker and Heere (2011) reported adequate reliability ($\alpha = .92$) and validity ($\text{AVE} = .77$) of the original scale.

**Sport involvement.** Several scholars (e.g., Armstrong, 2002; Kerstetter & Kovich, 1997; Laurent & Kapferer, 1985) in the field of sport management have utilized a multi-dimensional construct while others (e.g., Hill & Green, 2000; McGehee et al., 2003; Zaichkowsky, 1994) have used a uni-dimensional construct to measure sport involvement. This study utilized the revised personal involvement inventory (PII) scale as a uni-dimensional construct developed by Zaichkowsky (1994). Originally, PII scale was developed by Zaichkowsky (1985) with 20 items to measure the motivational state of involvement. However, the author reduced items from 20 to 10 items due to redundancy of the items as well as the lack of validity of the original scale. The reduced PII scale with 10 items was utilized by several scholars (e.g., Lichtenstein, Bloch, & Black, 1988; Munson & McQuarrie, 1987), and is considered as a best representation of involvement (Zaichkowsky, 1994). Specifically, sport involvement consisted of 10 different types of semantic items scored on 7-point Likert type scale: To me, Arkansas Razorbacks are (1) important and unimportant; (2) boring and interesting; (3) relevant and irrelevant; (4) exciting and unexciting; (5) means nothing and means a lot; (6) appealing and unappealing; (7) fascinating and mundane; (8) worthless and valuable; (9) involving and uninvolved; (10) not needed and needed. Zaichkowsky (1994) reported the Cronbach’s alphas of revised PII ranged from .91 to .96 for different domains of products and advertisement. Among 10 items, six items (i.e., important and unimportant, relevant and irrelevant, exciting and unexciting, appealing and unappealing, fascinating and mundane, involving and uninvolved) were formed as reversed coded items.
Commitment. Commitment was measured by Psychological Commitment to Team (PCT) scale originally developed by Mahony et al. (2000). Among 14 items, however, seven items were eliminated in this study based on the suggestions by Kwon and Trail (2003). In particular, Kwon and Trail (2003) attempted to extend the PCT scale by examining construct and concurrent validity, and commented the lack of construct validity and low factor loading. Therefore, seven items with low factor loading below .70 were excluded in this study (Kwon & Trail, 2003).

Statements used to measure commitment were: (1) I would watch a game featuring the Arkansas Razorbacks regardless of which team they are playing; (2) Being a fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks is important to me; (3) Nothing could change my allegiance to the Arkansas Razorbacks; (4) I am a committed fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks; (5) I would never switch my loyalty from the Arkansas Razorbacks even if my close friends were fans of another team; (6) It would be unlikely for me to change my allegiance from the Arkansas Razorbacks to another team; (7) It would be difficult to change my beliefs about the Arkansas Razorbacks. Scale items were measured by 7-point Likert type scale anchored by 1 as strongly disagree to 7 as strongly agree. The Cronbach’s alphas for the PCT scale ranged from .88 to .94 for three different samples collected from three different universities, including University of Oklahoma, Ohio State University, and University of Louisville (Mahony et al., 2000).

Conative loyalty. Conative loyalty was measured by the Intentions for Sport Consumption Behavior Scale (ISCBS) with four items adopted and modified from the study conducted by Trail et al. (2005). Statements used to measure conative loyalty were: (1) I am likely to support the Arkansas Razorbacks in the future; (2) I am likely to attend future Arkansas Razorbacks games; (3) I am likely to purchase Arkansas Razorbacks merchandise in the future; (4) I am likely to buy Arkansas Razorbacks clothing in the future. Scale items were measured by
7-point Likert type scale anchored by 1 as *strongly disagree* to 7 as *strongly agree*. The authors reported adequate reliability ($\alpha = .84$) and validity (AVE = .59) of the scale.

**Data Analysis**

This study utilized structural equation modeling (SEM) that enables researchers to assess and modify the theoretical model (Inoue, 2011). Moreover, SEM provides certain advantages compared with other traditional quantitative methods, including regression, analysis of variance (ANOVA), multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), and multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) (Bagozzi & Yi, 1989; Hair et al., 2006; Inoue, 2011; Weston & Gore, 2006). First, SEM is unrestricted to the assumption of homogeneity in the variances and covariances of the dependent variables across groups (Bagozzi & Yi, 1989). Second, SEM has an ability to control the effect of measurement errors, reducing the chance of type II errors (Bagozzi & Yi, 1989; Hair et al., 2006; Weston & Gore, 2006). Third, SEM can allow researchers to develop and test multivariate models (Bagozzi & Yi, 1989; Weston & Gore, 2006).

After collecting data, it was analyzed in five steps using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 20.0 version and Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) 20.0 version. First of all, the data were assessed to check missing values. The list-wise deletion method was conducted to exclude missing data from the original data. Second, descriptive statistics, including frequency, mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum values, were used to summarize the data for the demographic variables, awareness of CSR, sport involvement, commitment, and conative loyalty. In addition, skewness and kurtosis values of the items were assessed to identify the shape of the data distribution. Salisu, Chinyio, and Suresh (2015) asserted checking normality and outlier should be conducted in order to develop sound and
reliable research. Moreover, several scholars (e.g., Byrne, 2010; DeCarlo, 1997) emphasized that researchers should consider skewness and kurtosis when conducting SEM because it affects the test of variance and covariances. Absolute values less than 3.0 for skewness and 5.0 for kurtosis were employed as a cutoff value based on the recommendation of Kline (2011) and Ullman and Bentler (2001) respectively. Third, internal consistency was examined using Cronbach’s alpha to verify the reliability of each multi-item construct. The cutoff value for adequate reliability is Cronbach’s alpha of .70 or higher based on the suggestion by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). The descriptive and reliability analyses were conducted using SPSS 20.0. Fourth, a two-step approach recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) was employed to assess the model fit. Specifically, this two-step approach indicated that the fit of the measurement model is examined through a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) prior to the assessment of the fit of the structural equation model by comparing with other structural equation models (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Therefore, CFA was performed using AMOS 20.0 with a maximum likelihood estimation method to identify factorial structure of observed variables. The maximum likelihood estimation method can minimize residuals between the observed and latent variables (Cho, 2011). Finally, SEM was employed to identify the hypothesized relationships among the constructs.

Construct validity was assessed in the analysis of the measurement model. Construct validity is “directly concerned with the theoretical relationship of a variable to other variables” (DeVellis, 1991, p. 53), and it contains two aspects, including convergent validity and discriminant validity. Convergent validity refers to the degree to which the measures of constructs are related to the same or similar constructs (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Convergent validity can be assessed by two ways. First, convergent validity is assessed by significant factor loading, greater than .50 in the measurement model (Anderson & Gerbing,
Factor loading is also utilized to verify the hypothesized relationship between latent variables and measured variables (i.e., indicators) (Hair et al., 2006). Second, convergent validity is assessed by calculating average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) of each latent construct. Convergent validity is confirmed if the AVE of each latent construct was equal to or greater than .50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), or if the CR of each latent construct was equal to or greater than .70 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Discriminant validity refers to the degree to which the measures of constructs are distinct and uncorrelated with other constructs (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Discriminant validity can be confirmed if the square root of AVE exceeded the correlation coefficients (Hair et al., 2006). Correlation coefficients among the latent variables were assessed based on the suggestion of Kline (2011), maximum values less than .85.

Analysis of measurement and structural model was used based on the standard fit criteria. In particular, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR) were utilized to identify model fit for the measurement model and structural equation model (Bentler & Dudgeon, 1996; Browne & Cudeck, 1992). For instance, The Values for CFI and TLT equal to or greater than .90 is to be acceptable (Hair et al., 2006). The values for SRMR and RMSEA equal to or less than .08 are considered as acceptable fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1992). The acceptable model fit indices are summarized in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1. Acceptable Model Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit Indices</th>
<th>Acceptable Fit Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>CFI ≥ .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>TLI ≥ .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>RMSEA ≤ .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR)</td>
<td>SRMR ≤ .08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter provides the results of the study as follows: (a) final data collection, (b) results of the screening questions, (c) demographic characteristics, (d) reliability and validity, (e) results of the measurement model, and (f) results of the structural model.

Final Data Collection

College students, including undergraduate and graduate students, were recruited to complete the online survey between March 1\textsuperscript{st} and April 30\textsuperscript{th}, 2017. The survey invitation emails were sent to students enrolled in eight different courses under three different colleges by professors of each class. Thus, students have different background and different majors. A total of 385 students participated in the online survey. Of the 385 responses, 14 were unusable due to missing data, leaving a final sample of 371.

Results of the Screening Questions

At the beginning of the questionnaire, three screening questions were asked to survey participants: (1) to ensure only those respondents who were familiar with the Arkansas Razorbacks were captured thereby eliminating any potentially biased and unfamiliar responses, (2) to capture those respondents who were sport consumers, and (3) to classify two groups, including student-athlete and non-athlete. As the results of the first and second screening questions, five respondents (1.3\%) answered \textit{No} for the first question which indicated that they are not familiar with the Arkansas Razorbacks, and 13 respondents (3.5\%) answered \textit{No} for the second question which indicated they haven’t watched sporting events, attended sporting events,
purchased sport-related merchandises, or participated in sport activities. Since three respondents answered No on both screening questions, 15 responses were excluded. Of the 371 responses, therefore, 356 were utilized in further analysis. An independent sample t-test was employed to examine whether both groups of students (e.g., student-athlete and non-athlete) exhibit different perspectives on conative loyalty. The result of Levene’s test for the homogeneity of variances indicated the variances of were equal over the groups, $F(1, 354) = .124, p = .725$. Findings from an independent sample t-test, $t(354) = .092, p = .927$, revealed no significant difference on conative loyalty between student-athlete ($M = 5.93, SD = 1.26$) and non-athlete groups ($M = 5.91, SD = 1.33$). Thus, the findings supported the use of student-athlete sample along with non-athlete sample in further analysis.

Table 4.1. The Results of T-test for Conative Loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conative loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student –athlete</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-athlete</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Characteristics

Table 4.2 presents a summary of demographic characteristics of the 356 participants. Of the 356 participants in this study, 180 (50.6%) were male and 176 (49.4%) were female. The largest of the participants were Caucasian ($N = 281, 78.9\%$). The majority of the participants ($N = 321, 90.2\%$) were aged less than 24 years old, and the remaining participants ($N = 35, 9.8\%$) were 24 or over. Most of the participants were undergraduate students ($N = 328, 92.1\%$).
Table 4.2. Demographic Characteristics of Sample ($n = 356$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency ($n = 356$)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interracial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-21 years old</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22-25 years old</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-29 years old</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-33 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 years old and over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 shows descriptive statistics of each item. The mean scores ranged from 5.24 to 6.15, indicating that the respondents provided favorable evaluations. The standard deviation (SD) values ranged from 1.248 to 1.801, supporting adequate variations in the data. All skewness and kurtosis values of the items were within the acceptable level based on the recommendation of Kline (2011) and Ullman and Bentler (2001), absolute values less than 3.0 for skewness and 5.0 for kurtosis respectively.

Table 4.3. Descriptive Statistics of Each Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Items</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
<th>Min(Max)</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of CSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am aware of the social programs of the Arkansas Razorbacks</td>
<td>5.43(1.676)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.060</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am aware of the programs of the Arkansas Razorbacks that benefit the community</td>
<td>5.27(1.730)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-.922</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know of the good things the Arkansas Razorbacks do for the community</td>
<td>5.46(1.636)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.014</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe the Arkansas Razorbacks to be a socially responsible organization</td>
<td>5.52(1.458)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.111</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Unimportant/Important</td>
<td>5.97(1.506)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.747</td>
<td>2.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Boring/Interesting</td>
<td>6.08(1.321)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.906</td>
<td>3.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Irrelevant/ Relevant</td>
<td>5.68(1.755)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.396</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Unexciting/Exciting</td>
<td>5.94(1.545)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.714</td>
<td>2.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Means nothing/Means a lot</td>
<td>5.81(1.447)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.448</td>
<td>1.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Unappealing/Appealing</td>
<td>5.93(1.431)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.534</td>
<td>1.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Mundane/Fascinating</td>
<td>5.76(1.421)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.136</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Worthless/Valuable</td>
<td>6.03(1.265)</td>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>-1.793</td>
<td>3.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3. Descriptive Statistics of Each Item (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Min (Max)</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Uninvolving/Involving</td>
<td>5.96 (1.377)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>-1.598</td>
<td>2.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Not needed/Needed</td>
<td>6.15 (1.248)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>-1.796</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commitment

1. It would be unlikely for me to change my allegiance from the Arkansas Razorbacks to another team | 5.69 (1.770) | 1 (7) | -1.371 | .853 |
2. I would watch a game featuring the Arkansas Razorbacks regardless of which team they are playing | 5.73 (1.626) | 1 (7) | -1.432 | 1.337 |
3. Nothing could change my allegiance to the Arkansas Razorbacks | 5.24 (1.801) | 1 (7) | -0.858 | -.212 |
4. It would be difficult to change my beliefs about the Arkansas Razorbacks | 5.48 (1.498) | 1 (7) | -0.886 | .068 |
5. Being a fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks is important to me | 5.60 (1.577) | 1 (7) | -1.277 | 1.133 |
6. I am a committed fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks | 5.62 (1.623) | 1 (7) | -1.248 | .825 |
7. I would never switch my loyalty from the Arkansas Razorbacks even if my close friends were fans of another team | 5.58 (1.621) | 1 (7) | -1.132 | .565 |

Conative loyalty

1. I am likely to support the Arkansas Razorbacks in the future | 5.92 (1.433) | 1 (7) | -1.694 | 2.775 |
2. I am likely to attend future Arkansas Razorbacks games | 5.92 (1.439) | 1 (7) | -1.618 | 2.407 |
3. I am likely to purchase Arkansas Razorbacks merchandise in the future | 5.86 (1.463) | 1 (7) | -1.495 | 1.913 |
4. I am likely to buy Arkansas Razorbacks clothing in the future | 5.94 (1.407) | 1 (7) | -1.617 | 2.377 |

Reliability and Validity

Reliability coefficients of all constructs exceeded the recommended benchmark of .70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), supporting the claim that the items for each construct were
considered to have an acceptable level of internal consistency: awareness of CSR, $\alpha = .876$; sport involvement, $\alpha = .948$; commitment, $\alpha = .923$; conative loyalty, $\alpha = .938$.

Evidence of convergent validity was found by examining significant factor loading or calculating composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE) of each latent construct. First, Table 4.4 presents factor loadings of all items exceeded a recommended cutoff value of .50 in the measurement model (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bagozzi & Yi, 1989), indicating that the measurement model was considered to possess convergent validity. Second, the study also utilized CR and AVE values to confirm convergent validity. As shown in Table 4.5, the CR for all latent constructs exceeded a recommended cutoff value of .70, ranged from .737 to .893 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Furthermore, the AVE values for all latent constructs exceeded a recommended cutoff value of .50, ranged from .634 to .764 (Hair et al., 2006).

Table 4.4. Factor Loadings of Initial and Final CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Items</th>
<th>Initial CFA</th>
<th>Final CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness of CSR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am aware of the social programs of the Arkansas Razorbacks</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am aware of the programs of the Arkansas Razorbacks that benefit the community</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know of the good things the Arkansas Razorbacks do for the community</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe the Arkansas Razorbacks to be a socially responsible organization</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Unimportant/Important</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Boring/Interesting</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4. Factor Loadings of Initial and Final CFA (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Items</th>
<th>Initial CFA</th>
<th>Final CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Unexciting/Exciting</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Means nothing/Means a lot</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Unappealing/Appealing</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Mundane/Fascinating</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Worthless/Valuable</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Uninvolving/Involving</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Not needed/Needed</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commitment

1. It would be unlikely for me to change my allegiance from the Arkansas Razorbacks to another team | .608 | .621 |
2. I would watch a game featuring the Arkansas Razorbacks regardless of which team they are playing | .812 | .827 |
3. Nothing could change my allegiance to the Arkansas Razorbacks | .767 | .792 |
4. It would be difficult to change my beliefs about the Arkansas Razorbacks | .674 | .693 |
5. Being a fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks is important to me | .930 | .880 |
6. I am a committed fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks | .918 | .865 |
7. I would never switch my loyalty from the Arkansas Razorbacks even if my close friends were fans of another team | .835 | .859 |

Conative loyalty

1. I am likely to support the Arkansas Razorbacks in the future | .891 | .929 |
2. I am likely to attend future Arkansas Razorbacks games | .884 | .890 |
3. I am likely to purchase Arkansas Razorbacks merchandise in the future | .914 | .862 |
4. I am likely to buy Arkansas Razorbacks clothing in the future | .871 | .812 |
Discriminant validity was further assessed through the examination of the correlation coefficients between the variables. Diagonal values in Table 4.5 represent the square roots of the AVE values of the constructs. The square roots of the AVE values were greater than correlation coefficients between any pairs of variables, excluding one pair of variables (i.e., awareness of CSR and commitment). Given the evidence (e.g., Cronbach’s alphas, factor loadings, CR, AVE, etc.), the measurement model was considered to possess reliability and validity.

As shown in Table 4.5, the correlation coefficients between the variables were examined, and found correlations among the latent variables were less than .85 satisfied with the suggestion of Kline (2011).

Table 4.5. Correlation Coefficients between the Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Awareness of CSR</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sport involvement</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.546**</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.809**</td>
<td>.604**</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conative loyalty</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>.669**</td>
<td>.562**</td>
<td>.778**</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CR = Composite reliability; AVE = Average variance extracted; * p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01.

Results of the Measurement Model

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to evaluate the original measurement model with 25 items using AMOS 20.0. As a result from CFA, the goodness-of-fit indices did not support the acceptable fit of the model, $\chi^2(269) = 1314.715, p < .001$, CFI = .878, TLI = .864, RMSEA = .105, SRMR = .048. However, modification indices suggested the model would fit better if four parameters were allowed to be freely estimated. As a result, the covariances of the
four pairs of error terms (i.e., e7-e8, e10-e11, e19-e20, and e24-e25) were added in the final measurement model (See Figure 4.1). Koo (2012) suggested the error terms can be freely estimated, and it can be theoretically justifiable when the two sets of items measure similar content. For instance, the covariances of the four pairs of error terms in this study were: (1) To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Irrelevant/Relevant and Unexciting/Exciting; (2) To me, the Arkansas Razorbacks are Unappealing/Appealing and Mundane/Fascinating; (3) Being a fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks is important to me and I am a committed fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks; (4) I am likely to purchase Arkansas Razorbacks merchandise in the future and I am likely to buy Arkansas Razorbacks clothing in the future. Since the four sets of items measure similar content (e.g., fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks or purchasing sport-related products), the error terms were allowed to be freely estimated.

As shown in Table 4.6, the final CFA model provided better fit indices, $\chi^2(265) = 838.267$, $p < .001$, CFI = .933, TLI = .925, RMSEA = .078, SRMR = .043, when compared to the initial model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial model</td>
<td>1314.715</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final model</td>
<td>838.267</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Comparison of Model Fit Indices between Initial and Final Model
Figure 4.1. The Final CFA Model
Results of the Structural Model

Structural equation modeling was employed to identify the hypothesized relationships among the constructs, including awareness of CSR (4 items), sport involvement (10 items), commitment (7 items), and conative loyalty (4 items). The overall model fit of the structural model was assessed using goodness-of-fit indices, and the results of SEM provided the following fit indices, $\chi^2(265) = 838.267, p < .001$, CFI = .933, TLI = .925, RMSEA = .078, SRMR = .043, which support an adequate model fit.

The results of path coefficients revealed that awareness of CSR had a statistically significant positive impact on sport involvement ($\beta = .607, p < .001$) and commitment ($\beta = .785, p < .001$). The results also indicated sport involvement had a statistically significant positive impact on commitment ($\beta = .188, p < .001$), and commitment had a statistically significant positive impact on conative loyalty ($\beta = .957, p < .001$). However, both awareness of CSR and sport involvement had no statistically significant impact on conative loyalty.

Therefore, the follow-up analysis was performed without the direct paths (i.e., awareness of CSR $\rightarrow$ conative loyalty and sport involvement $\rightarrow$ conative loyalty) that were not statistically significant in structural equation modeling to achieve model parsimony. As shown in Table 4.7, the hypothesized model and an alternative model were compared in order to determine the appropriateness of the final structural model, and both models provided almost same goodness-of-fit indices. Although the exclusion of these direct paths is inconsistent with previous findings, the alternative model represents the more appropriate solution than the original model because of achieving model parsimony.
Table 4.7. Comparison of Model Fit Indices between Hypothesized and Alternative Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized model</td>
<td>838.267</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative model</td>
<td>839.847</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2 illustrates the alternative model as the final structural model with standardized path coefficients. The results indicated awareness of CSR had a statistically significant positive effect on sport involvement ($\beta = .608, p < .001$) and commitment ($\beta = .779, p < .001$), confirming hypotheses 1 and 2. Sport involvement had a statistically significant positive effect on commitment ($\beta = .194, p < .001$), and commitment also had a statistically significant positive effect on conative loyalty ($\beta = .868, p < .001$), supporting hypotheses 4 and 7. However, hypotheses 3 (i.e., direct relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty) and 5 (i.e., direct relationship between sport involvement and conative loyalty) were rejected since the final SEM model excluded these direct paths.
Results of the Indirect Effects

Bootstrapping method was conducted to identify indirect effects of sport involvement and commitment. As for the mediation of sport involvement between awareness of CSR and commitment, hypothesis 6 was rejected because of the exclusion of the direct paths between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty as well as sport involvement and conative loyalty. The bias-corrected 95% confidence interval (CI) for indirect effect based on 500 bootstrap samples confirmed that commitment positively mediated the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty ($\beta = .779$, $p = .003$), supporting hypothesis 8. However, the indirect effect of commitment in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty is overall effects, including these paths (i.e., awareness of CSR $\rightarrow$ commitment $\rightarrow$ conative loyalty and awareness of CSR $\rightarrow$ sport involvement $\rightarrow$ commitment $\rightarrow$ conative loyalty) since AMOS does not allow researcher to untangle unique indirect effect respectively. In addition, the results of the study
found that sport involvement positively mediated the relationship between awareness of CSR and commitment ($\beta = .118, p = .003$), and commitment played mediating role in the relationship between sport involvement and conative loyalty ($\beta = .168, p = .003$).
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the research findings of the study that aimed to understand CSR on conative loyalty in collegiate sports. The findings provide theoretical and managerial implications. In addition, limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are suggested. Finally, the chapter concludes by providing an overall summary of the study.

Discussion of the Findings

Over the past decades, corporate social responsibility has become an important topic across multiple academic disciplines because of its effectiveness as a marketing or communication tool to strengthen the relationship with stakeholders such as investors, suppliers, consumers, employees, and governments (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Bhattacharya et al., 2009; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Du et al., 2007; Margolis & Walsh, 2003; Pirsch et al., 2007; Ramasamy & Ting, 2004; Ross et al., 1991). The phenomena led scholars in the field of sport management, as well as marketing managers in sporting organizations, to focus on this topic since socially responsible activities provide numerous benefits for both society (e.g., contributing to public health, safety, education, human rights, community well-being, and environment) and sporting organizations (e.g., attracting new customers, enhancing sales of products, and developing positive brand image or reputation) (Inoue, 2011; Kim, 2015; Kotler & Lee, 2005; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007; Hwang, 2015). In spite of the importance of socially responsible activities in the sport industry (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006), a dearth of research has empirically examined the importance of social responsibility in a collegiate sport setting (Polite et al., 2011). Therefore, the need to scrutinize the outcomes of socially responsible activities, as practiced by
collegiate athletic departments, was identified. Even though several psychological constructs (e.g., identification, attachment, attraction, association, involvement, and commitment) or constraints (e.g., financial, social, and environmental constraints) may influence sport consumers’ actual behaviors (e.g., attending sporting events and purchasing sport related merchandise), the concept of loyalty is considered as the most important construct to retain consumers (Funk & James, 2001; Han et al., 2011). Consumer loyalty is also a significant factor for increasing revenues, developing a reputation, enhancing community development, and improving the quality of life (Bowen & Chen, 2001; Cheng, 2011; Inoue et al., 2017; Iwasaki & Havitz, 2004; Reynolds & Arnold, 2000). Thus, this study examined the role of college sport consumers’ awareness of socially responsible activities conducted by a collegiate athletic department in influencing their conative loyalty (i.e., attending future games, purchasing team merchandise, buying team clothing, and supporting the team). Several scholars generally identified the construct of loyalty as attitudinal and behavioral aspects (Cheng, 2011; Han et al., 2011; Inoue et al., 2015) because only one aspect is not sufficient to measure true loyalty precisely (Evanschitzky & Wunderlich, 2006; Han et al., 2011; Oliver, 1997). However, the study utilized conative loyalty because it is considered as an appropriate concept to identify consumers’ actual behavior (Choi et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2013). In addition, sport involvement and commitment are considered as key constructs for building a strong relationship between sporting organizations and sport consumers (e.g., fans). Ko et al. (2012) identified a loyal fan base can contribute to the success of sporting organization, and the loyal fan base can be developed by a good relationship with their consumers or fans by fulfilling their needs and wants. Since socially responsible activities would be one of the consumers’ needs or wants (Han et al., 2011), this
study intended to identify how sport involvement and commitment play a role as mediators in the relationship between consumers’ awareness of CSR and conative loyalty.

For the measurement model analysis, CFA was conducted with 25 items. These items for each construct have an acceptable level of internal consistency based on Cronbach’s alpha of .70 or higher suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). Moreover, convergent validity and discriminant validity were confirmed by examining factor loadings, CR, and AVE of all items. Since the initial model provided a poor model fit, modification of the model was conducted based on modification indices. In order to improve model fit, four pairs of error terms were covaried based on the suggestion by Koo (2012) who stated the pair of error terms can be freely estimated when the two sets of items measure similar content. Finally, the modified model as the final CFA model provided an adequate model fit, \( \chi^2(265) = 838.267, p < .001, \text{CFI} = .933, \text{TLI} = .925, \text{RMSEA} = .078, \text{SRMR} = .043. \)

For the structural model analysis, SEM was employed with the final CFA model to identify the hypothesized relationship among the constructs. Although the SEM model provided an adequate model fit, two estimated parameters (i.e., awareness of CSR \( \rightarrow \) conative loyalty and sport involvement \( \rightarrow \) conative loyalty) of the six estimated parameters were not statistically significant. Therefore, the follow-up analysis was performed without these two estimated parameters because of the model parsimony. Parsimonious model is considered as a simple model (e.g., few predictor variables) with great explanatory predictive power. If the difference of model fits between two models were relatively small, the more parsimonious model is considered to be an appropriate model (Bentler & Mooijaart, 1989). This method was commonly utilized in previous research to develop a parsimonious model. For instance, Kwak and Kwon (2016) eliminated a non-significant path in the model to develop a parsimonious model. Based
on the comparison of model fit indices, the alternative model with exclusion of the two estimated parameters was considered to be a more appropriate model in this study.

The results of this study indicated that sport consumers’ awareness of socially responsible activities conducted by collegiate athletic departments was positively associated with sport involvement and commitment, confirming hypotheses 1 and 2. However, consumer awareness of CSR had no direct effect on conative loyalty, rejecting hypothesis 3. Findings from this study provided empirical evidence of positive effect of CSR awareness on both psychological variables (i.e., sport involvement and commitment). The findings are consistent with previous research which indicated perceived CSR had a significant positive effect on involvement (Inoue et al., 2017), and perceived socially responsible activities in college athletics significantly influenced commitment toward the organization (Ko et al., 2014). The contribution of CSR activities to organizations is substantial and well-documented (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Breitbarth & Harris, 2008; Brown & Dacin, 1997; Lai et al., 2010; Fatma et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2014; Hur et al., 2014; Ko et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2012; Walker & Kent, 2009; Walker & Heere, 2011). For example, Walker and Kent (2009) found that consumers’ perception of CSR activities positively influenced patronage intentions, including merchandise consumption and word of mouth intention. Inoue et al. (2015) also revealed that CSR activities had a positive association with attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. However, the results of this study are inconsistent with the above findings.

One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that the context of collegiate sports represents a unique setting where sport consumers’ awareness of socially responsible activities has a minimal effect on loyalty perspectives, including attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. Most college sports consumers or fans are college students, faculty/staff, alumni, and local residents
College students, faculty/staff, and alumni are considered highly identified sport consumers or fans of their college sport teams since they are directly associated with their college or university through a sense of belonging. Although local residents don’t have any direct association with a local college or university, they are also considered highly identified sport consumers or fans of the local college sport teams or the college because the local college represents a region, and local residents are more attached to their region (Chang et al., 2016). Additionally, there is possibility that subjects in this study, college students, don’t differentiate between CSR activities of athletics and CSR activities of university. Hence, it is uncertain that the results of this study are applicable to a professional sport setting or other service business context.

The findings in the study revealed sport involvement had a statistically significant positive effect on commitment, supporting hypothesis 4. However, sport involvement had no direct effect on conative loyalty, rejecting hypothesis 5. Over the past decades, several scholars have examined the relationship among involvement, commitment, and loyalty. Nevertheless, the previous studies have produced different results. For instance, Bee and Havitz (2010) found involvement is an essential precondition for attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. Hill and Green (2000) revealed psychological involvement positively influenced intention to participate in sport activities. Similarly, Armstrong (2002) stated the level of sport involvement had a significant effect on sport event attendance and consumption. As the different outcomes, Iwasaki and Havitz (2004) compared the models (e.g., full mediated model and direct effect model), and found leisure involvement had no direct effect on behavioral loyalty while it had indirect effect on behavioral loyalty via psychological commitment. Tachis and Tzetzis (2015) also indicated that sport fans’ involvement positively influenced psychological commitment, and then psychological
commitment influenced attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. Their study identified that loyalty was not directly influenced by sport fans’ involvement, but the loyalty was triggered by involvement when psychological commitment played a mediating role in the relation.

The positive relationship between commitment and loyalty observed in this study has been supported by several scholars in the field of sport management (Bee & Havitz, 2010; Fernandes, Correia, Abreu, & Biscaia, 2013; Weiss & Weiss, 2006). For example, Bee and Havitz (2010) found that psychological commitment had positively associated with behavioral loyalty. Magnusen et al. (2012) revealed commitment positively influenced intention for sport consumers’ game attendance. The result of this study is consistent with the above findings by identifying a positive effect of commitment on conative loyalty, supporting hypothesis 7.

Since the present study intended to identify the mediating effect of sport involvement in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty, hypothesis 6 was rejected because of the exclusion of the direct paths between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty as well as sport involvement and conative loyalty. This finding is inconsistent with previous studies as Inoue et al. (2015) identified sport involvement positively mediated in the relationship between perceived CSR and loyalty. As for the mediation of commitment in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty, hypothesis 8 was confirmed. This finding of the study is parallel with the past research from Magnusen et al. (2012) which indicated that commitment played a mediating role in the relationship between reciprocity and intention for sport consumer’s attendance of sporting events. Similarly, Ko et al. (2014) found commitment was a significant mediator in the relationship between perceived CSR and donation intention.

One of the interesting findings in this study was that a mediating effect of sport involvement emerged in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty when
the effect of commitment as a mediator was simultaneously examined. Specifically, the findings showed that awareness of CSR influenced sport involvement, in turn, influenced commitment, and eventually commitment influenced conative loyalty. Even though Heere and Dickson (2008) asserted that sport involvement and commitment as psychological constructs are conceptually confused and overlapped, the finding of this study clearly showed the distinction between the two psychological constructs by identifying sport involvement as an antecedent factor of commitment. Additionally, the correlation coefficient \( r = .604 \) between two variables was relatively small in this study. The phenomena is supported by previous research conducted by Iwasaki and Havitz (1998) which indicated that personal involvement in a recreational activity is antecedent of psychological commitment. Tachis and Tzetzis (2015) also revealed sport fans’ involvement positively influenced psychological commitment. Collectively, the findings of the study posit that even though sport involvement had no statistically significant effect on conative loyalty, it could be an effective vehicle for leveraging consumer behavior when commitment is evoked by high level of involvement.

In order to explore mediating role of sport involvement and commitment, two additional analyses were performed since sport involvement was not independently identified as a mediator in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty. First, commitment was removed from the original structural model while keeping all variables. Second, sport involvement was removed from the original structural model while keeping all variables. The results of these two additional analyses revealed that both indirect effects of sport involvement and commitment were statistically significant, respectively. However, the results also showed that commitment \( \beta = .874 \) could be considered as a more influential factor than sport involvement \( \beta = .133 \) as a mediator in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative
loyalty. Thus, it seems to be more appropriate when both sport involvement and commitment are simultaneously examined to understand the effect of CSR awareness on sport consumer behavior (e.g., attending sporting events, participating in sports, and purchasing sport-related merchandise).

Based on the findings in the present study, it was confirmed that when sport consumers are aware of socially responsible activities conducted by their favorite sport team, they are more likely to be involved and committed toward the team which, in turn, positively influenced their consumer behavior. This finding provides new empirical evidence regarding the process of how sport involvement and commitment are developed through CSR activities as well as why the high level of involvement and commitment positively influence consumer behavior. This study thus contributes to the literature by suggesting that college athletic departments should design, communicate, and initiate socially responsible activities in the community so that the sport consumers or fans recognize the good things their favorite sport team does for the community. Marketing managers in sporting organizations can utilize social media or other online channels (e.g., intercollegiate athletic website) to enhance awareness of sport consumers regarding socially responsible activities since using social media or other online channels would be a way to increase interaction between sport consumers and sporting organizations.

The study extends the theoretical underpinning of the social exchange theory by demonstrating the mutual benefit between sport consumers and sporting organizations. Sport consumers receive tangible (e.g., having educational support) or intangible (e.g., feeling good) benefits from socially responsible activities while sporting organizations receive benefits such as increased levels of customer satisfaction and positive customer evaluations which, in turn, generate revenues because sport consumers who experienced the benefits from social activities
of their favorite sporting organizations are more likely to attend the team’s sporting events, purchase the team’s merchandise, and support the team (Brown & Dacin, 1997; Kim et al., 2010).

Another key contribution of the study is related to the mediating effects of sport involvement and commitment. The finding revealed that the formation of high involvement is a precondition to a committed sport consumer toward organizations, and the formation of high commitment is also precondition to become a loyal consumer. Since the result of this study showed awareness of CSR has no direct effect on conative loyalty, it contributes to the literature by suggesting that utilizing psychological variables (i.e., sport involvement and commitment) is essential to understanding the effect of CSR activities on conative loyalty. Accordingly, marketing managers in sporting organizations should develop marketing strategies (e.g., CSR initiative) to aim at enhancing consumer loyalty by fully understanding of the formation of involvement and commitment. Kapferer and Laurent (1993) explained level of involvement is determined based on the difference facets of involvement. Since this study utilized college sport consumers including four different groups (i.e., college students, faculty/staff, alumni, and local residents), marketing managers in college athletic department should segment their sport consumers by the four groups to implement different marketing strategies which may increase the level of involvement. In order to develop a strong fan base, it is important to identify how the commitment toward the organization is developed since the concept of commitment represents resistance to change (Fernandes et al., 2013). Thus, marketing managers should focus on handing social issues and problems within the community. Unlike a professional sport setting or other service business context, most college sport consumers or fans are member of college (e.g., college students, faculty/staff, and alumni) and local residents. Hence, it would be an easy way to develop strong psychological connections (e.g., commitment) with college sport consumers or
fans if the college athletic department demonstrates its commitments and contributions to the community. Another marketing strategy is that the college athletic department can create corporate partnerships with local non-profit and profit organizations to promote prosocial behaviors (e.g., helping people and having educational support). By doing so, the sporting organizations could be recognized as a corporate citizen, and it would be beneficial for both community and college athletic department in the long run.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The dissertation contains several limitations. First, this study collected data using a convenient sampling method which limited the generalizability of the result to the population. In addition, a convenient sampling method (e.g., collecting data from college students) caused the issue of external validity. Thus, further investigation is needed to examine the theoretical model using data collected from a generalized sample.

Second, this study identified the effect of sport consumers’ awareness of CSR on consumer behavior in a collegiate sport setting. The context of collegiate sports represents a unique setting where sport consumers’ awareness of social activities has a minimal effect on loyalty perspectives because most college sport consumers or fans are college students, faculty/staff, alumni, and local residents (Hwang, 2015). For instance, college students who are indifferent to college sports may purchase their college team clothing or may attend sporting games to support their college due to several reasons (e.g., sense of belonging, low ticket price, friends, etc.). Thus, the result of this study may be limited to a professional sport setting or other service business context.
Third, the current study adopted and modified scale items from the study conducted by Walker and Heere (2011) to measure awareness of CSR. The statements were begun with *I am aware of...* and *I know of...* to identify sport consumers’ awareness of the objects. Several scholars in the field of sponsorship and communication suggested that awareness can be measured by either recall or recognition (Walraven, Bijmolt, & Koning, 2014). The sponsorship recall method is the way to induce consumers to recall the object while the sponsorship recognition method is the way to induce consumers to select the object from a randomized list (Walraven et al., 2014). Thus, further investigation is needed to utilize the different methods of measuring awareness of CSR (e.g., using recall) in order to develop sound and reliable research.

Fourth, the study utilized psychological constructs (i.e., sport involvement and commitment) as a mediator in the relationship between college sport consumers’ awareness of CSR and their conative loyalty. However, the extant literature suggests several important research domains in sport consumer behavior. For instance, Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen (2010) revealed people are prideful of their favorite organizations (e.g., sport teams) when they aware of the socially responsible activities of their favorite organizations. Consequently, other substitutable variables, such as pride (Chang, Ko, Connaughton, & Kang, 2016; Du et al., 2010), team identification (Chang et al., 2016; He & Li, 2011; Walker & Kent, 2009), satisfaction (He & Li, 2011; Walsh & Bartikowski, 2013), trust (Ko et al., 2014; Vlachos et al., 2009), regional attachment (Chang et al., 2016), and brand equity (Hur et al., 2014), should be utilized to identify the effect of CSR on consumer behavior (e.g., loyalty) in the future research.

Fifth, this study intended to identify indirect effects of commitment between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty. However, the indirect effect of commitment in this study is overall effects, including these paths (i.e., awareness of CSR → commitment → conative loyalty and
awareness of CSR → sport involvement → commitment → conative loyalty) since AMOS does not allow researcher to untangle unique indirect effect respectively. Therefore, further investigation is necessary to identify indirect effects of each path individually using other statistical software (e.g., Mplus).

Finally, the study utilized conative loyalty as an outcome variable which was influenced by consumer’s awareness of CSR through sport involvement and commitment. Although the concept of conative loyalty is considered as the best predictor of actual consumption as well as the substitute for consumers’ attitudinal and behavioral loyalty (Trail et al., 2005) with various types of consumption behaviors, including attending sporting events, purchasing team merchandise, and supporting team psychologically, further investigation is necessary to utilize other types of consumption behaviors (e.g., word of mouth, media consumption, etc.) as outcome variables (Fernandes et al., 2013).

Conclusion

Even though several scholars in the field of sport management have examined the effect of CSR and its outcomes (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Heinze et al., 2014; Inoue et al., 2015; Walters & Tacon, 2010), the existing literature had yet to empirically examine the relationship among awareness of CSR, sport involvement, commitment, and conative loyalty in a collegiate sports setting. Therefore, this study investigated how sport consumers’ awareness of socially responsible activities conducted by a collegiate athletic department on their conative loyalty through sport involvement and commitment. The results of this study found that when sport consumers are aware of socially responsible activities conducted by their favorite sporting organizations or teams, they are more likely to be involved and committed toward the sporting
organizations or teams which, in turn, influenced their consumption behaviors (e.g., attending sporting events, participating in sports, and purchasing sport-related merchandise). This phenomenon could be explained by social exchange theory (e.g., mutual benefit). For instance, when sporting organizations or teams support community through socially responsible activities, it gives back to them from their consumers or fans by attending sporting events, purchasing sport-related merchandise, or supporting them. Furthermore, this study demonstrated the mediating role of sport involvement and commitment in the relationship between awareness of CSR and conative loyalty. Thus, the study contributes to a theoretical framework which can be utilized for future research on this topic. Finally, this study provides guidelines for marketing managers in sporting organizations by highlighting the role of socially responsible activities which, ideally, could lead to mutual benefits for both society and sporting organizations.
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MEMORANDUM

TO:        Sunyooong Kim
            Stephen Dittmore

FROM:      Ro Windwalker
            IRB Coordinator

RE:        New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #:  17-02-480

Protocol Title:  Investigating the Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Conative Loyalty

Review Type:  ☑ EXEMPT  □ EXPEDITED  □ FULL IRB

Approved Project Period:  Start Date: 03/01/2017  Expiration Date: 02/28/2018

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request using the form Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (https://vpred.uark.edu/units/scp/index.php). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 400 participants. If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval prior to implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Investigating the impact of corporate social responsibility on conative loyalty
in collegiate sports

Principal Researcher: Sunyoong Kim
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Stephen W. Dittmore

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

You are invited to participate in a research study about the impact of corporate social responsibility on conative loyalty. You are asked to take this survey, and it will take 10 minutes to complete this survey.

The purpose of this study is to identify the influence of college sport consumers’ awareness of socially responsible activities conducted by collegiate athletic department on their conative loyalty. Second, this study attempts to examine the mediating effects of sport involvement and commitment in the relationship.

If you do not want to be in this study, you may refuse to participate. Also, you may refuse to participate at any time during the study. There will be no negative effect at all if you refuse to participate. There is no anticipated risk to participating and all information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by applicable State and Federal law. At the conclusion of the study you will have the right to request feedback about the results and you have the right to contact the Principal Researcher as listed below for any concerns that you may have.

You may contact the Principal Researcher, Sunyoong Kim at sunkim@uark.edu, or the Faculty Advisor, Dr. Dittmore at dittmore@uark.edu, if you have any questions about this study. If you have concerns or questions about your rights as a research participant, please feel free to contact Ro Windwalker at the University of Arkansas Research Compliance Office, 479-575-2208 or irb@uark.edu.

Ro Windwalker, CIP
Institutional Review Board Coordinator
Research Compliance
University of Arkansas
109 MLKG Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201
479-575-2208
irb@uark.edu
APPENDIX C

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
**Screening Questions (3 items)**

1. Are you familiar with the Arkansas Razorbacks?
     ① Yes   ② No

2. Have you previously watched sporting events, attended sporting events, purchased sport-related merchandises, or participated in sport activities?
     ① Yes   ② No

3. Are you an Arkansas student-athlete?
     ① Yes   ② No

**Participant’s Demographic Information (4 items)**

1. Gender
     ① Male   ② Female

2. Ethnicity / Race
     ① Caucasian ② African American ③ Hispanic or Latino ④ Asian
      ⑤ Native American ⑥ Interracial ⑦ Other

3. Age ____________

4. Grade
     ① Freshman   ② Sophomore ③ Junior ④ Senior ⑤ Graduate student
Awareness of CSR (4 items)

1. I am aware of the social programs of the Arkansas Razorbacks.
   Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

2. I know of the good things the Arkansas Razorbacks do for the community.
   Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

3. I am aware of the programs of the Arkansas Razorbacks that benefit the community.
   Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

4. I believe the Arkansas Razorbacks to be a socially responsible organization.
   Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

Sport Involvement (10 items)

To me, college sport is

Important ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Unimportant
Boring ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Interesting
Relevant ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Irrelevant
Exciting ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Unexciting
Means nothing ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Means a lot
Appealing ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Unappealing
Fascinating ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Mundane
Worthless ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Valuable
Involving ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Uninvolving
Not needed ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Needed
**Commitment (7 items)**

1. I would watch a game featuring the Arkansas Razorbacks regardless of which team they are playing.
   - Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

2. Being a fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks is important to me.
   - Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

3. Nothing could change my allegiance to the Arkansas Razorbacks.
   - Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

4. I am a committed fan of the Arkansas Razorbacks.
   - Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

5. I would never switch my loyalty from the Arkansas Razorbacks even if my close friends were fans of another team.
   - Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

6. It would be unlikely for me to change my allegiance from the Arkansas Razorbacks to another team.
   - Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree

7. It would be difficult to change my beliefs about the Arkansas Razorbacks.
   - Strongly disagree ①--------②--------③--------④--------⑤--------⑥--------⑦ Strongly agree
**Conative Loyalty (4 items)**

1. I am likely to support the Arkansas Razorbacks in the future.
   
   Strongly disagree ①---------②---------③---------④---------⑤---------⑥---------⑦ Strongly agree

2. I am likely to attend future Arkansas Razorbacks games.

   Strongly disagree ①---------②---------③---------④---------⑤---------⑥---------⑦ Strongly agree

3. I am likely to purchase Arkansas Razorbacks merchandise in the future.

   Strongly disagree ①---------②---------③---------④---------⑤---------⑥---------⑦ Strongly agree

4. I am likely to buy Arkansas Razorbacks clothing in the future.

   Strongly disagree ①---------②---------③---------④---------⑤---------⑥---------⑦ Strongly agree