PLACE BONDING, FAN IDENTIFICATION, NOSTALGIA AND FENWAY'S FUTURE: OBSERVATIONS ABOUT RED SOX NATION

By

DANIEL SARGEANT

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2012

To my sister Lisa, without whom this would not have been possible

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the chair and members of my supervisory committee for their assistance: my chair Heather Gibson, and committee members Stephen Holland, Jeffery Adler, and Kyriaki Kaplanidou. I also thank the staff in the TRSM department at the University of Florida particularly Julie McGarth and Donna Walker, as well as the participants in my survey for their honest participation. I thank my family and friends for their support and assistance in completing this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PLACE BONDING, FAN IDENTIFICATION, NOSTALGIA AND FENWAY'S FUTURE: OBSERVATIONS ABOUT RED SOX NATION

By

Daniel Sargeant

August 2012

Chair: Heather Gibson
Major: Health and Human Performance

Fenway Park celebrated its one hundredth birthday at the start of the 2012 baseball season. It has hosted many historic moments and holds a special place in the hearts of avid baseball fans, but it cannot go on forever serving the needs of the Red Sox organization. At some point, it will need to be refurbished, rebuilt or replaced. Nostalgia, place bonding, and fan identification with the team are all potential factors affecting what individuals believe should be the future of the stadium.

We live in nostalgic times, which may be due to our aging population in the United States or the unsettling times in which we live. Regardless of the cause, nostalgia is something that businesses consider when making decisions, for example, companies marketing retro versions of their products. Fan identification is strong among Red Sox fans, perhaps as strong if not stronger than for any other team in professional sports. Boston residents often hold buildings and places in high regard. However, few researchers have empirically examined the connection between fan identification, nostalgia, and place bonding with a professional sports stadium. Thus, this study set out to empirically examine the levels of fan identification, nostalgia, and place bonding

among Greater Boston residents and their influence on people's attitudes toward potential future modifications of Fenway Park. Data were collected using an on-line survey via a link posted on the websites of two major Boston newspapers yielding 409 respondents.

The results, generated by the use of frequencies, ANOVAs and MANOVA, provide a more in-depth understanding of the relationship between attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park and fan identification, nostalgia, and place bonding. Overall, a majority of respondents were in favor of retaining the current structure with modifications and updates. This attitude corresponded with certain levels of fan identification, nostalgia, and place bonding. The findings support the supposition that significant relationships exist between how an individual feels about future modifications of Fenway Park and each of these factors. In addition, results indicated high levels of fan identification, nostalgia, and place bonding among most respondents. It is suggested that future research should attempt to gain access to a more diverse sampling of Greater Boston residents and/or Red Sox Nation fans in addition to replicating this study with other sporting facilities to aid in determining the generalizability of the results.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Historically, the city of Boston has been a hotbed of professional sports activity. In fact, Boston Red Sox fans have been labeled as some of the most obsessive in all of Major League Baseball (Smith, 2011). Not only do the Red Sox sellout their home games at a record level, but they also lead the league in road game attendance (Patton, 2007). The media coverage of the team dwarfs the coverage of any other professional sports franchise in the United States (Mnookn, 2006). Fenway Park, the home stadium of the Red Sox, is consistently listed as the number one tourist attraction in Boston ("Things to do in Boston", 2008). Whether visiting for a game or to tour the stadium, many tourists are motivated to visit the city because of the Red Sox. The Red Sox had such a demand from fans wanting to travel to away games that they became the first professional sports franchise in the United States to launch their own travel agency. The impact of the Red Sox Nation (RSN) on the Boston tourism industry is undeniable ("Things to do in Boston," 2011). Equally as important to the city, as well as the region, is the social impact of the RSN.

There is no firm date on when the RSN formed. Some will argue that it began in 1903 when the Royal Rooters, one of major league baseball's first organized fan clubs, followed the Boston Pilgrims to Pittsburgh for the first modern World Series. Since then, Boston's baseball team changed its name, and the devotion of the Boston baseball fans ebbed and flowed until 1967. Even though Boston baseball fans were devoted to their team since the very beginning, the phenomenon known as the dedicated Red Sox Nation was not born until the summer of 1967 during the closest pennant race in baseball history. Regardless of when the phenomenon began, its impact on New

England merits further examination to obtain a deeper understanding of the relationship between a devoted fan base and a sports facility.

At the heart of RSN sits Fenway Park, the oldest baseball facility in major league baseball. The revered old ballpark is both venerated and despised by some members of the RSN. Prior attempts to tear down the ballpark have almost succeeded, but it still stands as a historic landmark and well-known Boston symbol, not to mention Boston's most visited tourist attraction ("Things to do in Boston," 2008). Recent renovations have made Fenway Park more modern, but its small seating capacity affects tourists, local businesses and the team alike by limiting revenue streams, as well as ticket availability.

Fenway Park, built in 1912, has hosted some of the most memorable moments in baseball history, cementing its place as a revered site among baseball fans. Although the franchise began as the first dynasty in major league baseball by winning four of the first six World Series, the avidly loyal fan base was eventually lost after decades of mediocre play and mismanagement by team owners (Gutlon, 2009). Through the late fifties and early sixties, the Red Sox annually finished at the bottom of attendance rankings ("Boston Red Sox Attendance," 2011). What happened in 1967 not only ended the poor attendance, but also led to the rebirth of the RSN. For those who have never been to Fenway Park or lived in New England, it is difficult to convey just how dedicated current members of the RSN are and how much the team and Fenway Park mean to the region. Certainly, there are many teams that have devoted fan bases, but one would be hard pressed to be able to demonstrate that other teams' fans are more devoted or passionate than members of the RSN. There are many examples of just how devoted members of the RSN are to their team, but overall it comes down to the fact that there is

no denying the importance of the RSN to the region on a number of levels. Therefore, the RSN provides an excellent forum for studying a highly devoted fan base.

According to Borer (2008), the intense allure of the Red Sox team pervades and permeates the boundaries between politics, religion, sports, and popular culture in Boston and much of New England. He refers to Fenway Park as nothing short of a national icon among baseball fans, but suggests that even its storied history may not be enough to save it from being replaced by a more modern facility. In January of 2004, the New England Patriots won their second Super Bowl in three years. Moments after the game ended, thousands of fans filled the streets around Fenway Park to celebrate. Days later, as the championship winning Patriots paraded through the streets of Boston in front of a crowd estimated at over 1.5 million people, they were repeatedly serenaded with the chant “Yankees suck! Yankees suck!” This provides another example that other Boston teams might win championships, but the Red Sox’s still own Boston’s heart.

Rick Reilly, writing for *Sports Illustrated*, speculated that many of the newer ballparks are using Fenway Park as their muse in an attempt to capture some of Fenway Park’s magic. Historian John Demos (2000) posits that Fenway Park is an important part of Boston’s cultural identity and the Red Sox fans are an interesting subset of Boston society. He further suggests that Red Sox fans are more than an economic force in the Boston area, they are an important part of the regional culture as the region’s culture is passed down to new generations of Red Sox fans along with the team’s storied history. Borer (2008) concurs, positing that one must consider much more than economic impact when assessing the importance of the Red Sox team to the New England region, as they are an important subset of the local society and a part of

its culture. Schudson (1989, p.27) summarizes Fenway Park's importance by describing it as "a public and cultural relation among object, tradition, and audience" that allows present-day visitors to be a part of history each time they enter the ballpark.

Although the RSN may appear from the outside to be a homogeneous organization united by their love of all things relating to the Red Sox, in actuality, the nation is divided along several key variables, including what the future of Fenway Park should be, as well as the usual debates regarding team decisions. Some view the stadium as a symbol of Boston's history and culture; for others it is viewed as a historical landmark, yet others see it as a vital part of the city's landscape and community. In addition, there are those that view Fenway Park as being outdated and in need of replacing. This issue may not seem very important to those outside of the sports world, but it has important implications for the entire New England region, especially the city of Boston, due to the multiple roles the facility plays on a variety of levels.

In addition, the impact of the RSN on sports related tourism can be traced to the origins of professional baseball in Boston. Beginning with the first modern World Series in 1903, Red Sox fans have had a long history of both traveling to watch their team play, as well as traveling great distances to view a game at Fenway Park. Fans travel from all over the New England region to visit Fenway Park, often staying for several days and visiting other city attractions (Abrams, 2003). Some Red Sox fans travel from all over the country and even from other countries to watch the Red Sox play at Fenway Park. People come to Boston not only to watch games at Fenway Park, but also to visit and tour Fenway Park. This dissertation presents a study designed to gain a better

understanding of the impact of RSN as a social and cultural force in the Boston region. Particular attention is paid to the importance of team identification, nostalgia, and place bonding as they relate to opinions regarding Fenway Park's future. The economic consequence on the city of Boston is not limited to tourism. As anyone who has spent enough time in the Boston area can tell you, locals spend substantial sums of money related to their membership in the RSN.

When examining the sports psyche of the Boston area, particular attention should be paid to the time period between 1974 and 1978, as these were pivotal years in the development of the RSN as a national curiosity. Recent research concurs that this time period was critical to both the development of the city of Boston, as well as the Red Sox's organization (Bryant, 2002; Reynolds, 2009). Tager (2001) suggests the unrest in Boston during this time period was nothing new, but part of a long-standing tradition of social unrest in Boston. In regards to baseball, this period is circumscribed by two of the greatest games in the history of baseball. Both games have been credited with impacting baseball in ways that are still felt today (Reynolds, 2009). The 1978 season also signified one of the most fundamental changes in the history of baseball, the birth of free agency, a change that significantly altered the very framework of baseball. As most researchers tend to view organizations such as the RSN as homogeneous entities, it would be helpful to examine the differences that exist in such an organization. These developments are covered in the literature review, to assist the focus of this study.

Many view Fenway Park as the foundation of the RSN, but its continued existence is not assured. Another example of the divisions within the RSN is that it is divided by

differing views as to what to do with Fenway Park. Most members of RSN appear to understand the importance of Fenway as a historical landmark and a symbol of the city of Boston. There are six divisions of thought as to Fenway's future as suggested by local sports talk show hosts. Media reports and fan chatter imply that many fans want to keep Fenway as it has always been-not wanting any changes to be made to the facility. Others want to update the facility while paying careful attention to maintaining the integrity and character of the original design. Still others want an exact replica of Fenway built with more seating and modern comforts. A fourth segment reportedly wants to see Fenway knocked down and a new ballpark built outside of the congested Kenmore Square area. Others believe this new ballpark should be not a replica of Fenway; it should have unique characteristics dictated by its plot of land as Fenway did when it was built. Lastly, others seem to believe the current structure should be mostly retained with only minor upgrades or renovations (Ryan, 2005). The current ownership has to date sided with the second group, improving the current stadium while remaining true to the original park design. The fact that this is the current approach by no means suggests that this is the long-term solution. Even while spending millions on renovations, the current ownership has said it will listen to public and professional suggestions for the future of Fenway Park. Currently, the team owners are walking a tightrope between the various factions. They understand the historical and cultural values of Fenway Park, but they are businesspersons who purchased the team and the facility to make a profit.

Fenway Park is not just a place where the Red Sox play baseball. It has cultural and symbolic value to the city of Boston. The facility is often used as a symbol on

television and printed materials to represent Boston. It is familiar not only to baseball fans worldwide, but to many tourists who have researched visiting Boston for a vacation. In addition, it has a number of cultural meanings for those living in the city. Recent research suggests that baseball fulfills many of the same functions that religion used to in our society (Erickson, 2001; Newman, 2001). Specifically, the studies allude to baseball's facilities as places of reverence where collective prayer takes place. This may be a stretch in some cities, but not in Boston. Given the decline of churches in the New England region over the last three or four decades (McKinney and Hoge, 1983), it might be suggested that many ex-church goers have transferred their loyalties to the religion of baseball (Chidester, 1996). Perhaps fans want to hold onto Fenway Park as a means of connecting to their past. Some who have inquired about the importance of Fenway Park have talked about its importance to the city of Boston, but most have also pointed out that it is part of their personal history.

Fenway Park satisfies a number of functions for both baseball fans, as well as Boston residents. It serves as one of the building blocks of the city's urban culture. It also serves as an image and representation of the city. In addition, Fenway Park is a part of the urban community and civic culture of the city, as well the collective memory of residents. The facility serves an important sense of place function for fans. Perhaps most importantly, it is an important place in terms of social interactions and practices (Young, 1999).

Recognizing the importance of Fenway Park to the community, recent Red Sox team owners have made the facility much more accessible to the public. Fenway Park no longer has an off-season. The field might be covered for the off-season, but the rest

of the stadium does not close its doors. Since the most recent owners took over in 2002, the stadium has hosted charity events, political rallies, concerts, holiday celebrations, and tours. In January 2010, ice hockey was played before sellout crowds on the infield of Fenway Park. The frequency of non-baseball events held at Fenway Park has increased dramatically since 2002 and the current team owners decided to add on to the existing structure instead of replacing the facility. Their apparent goal is to make the facility more a part of the community, year round, and of course, to increase revenue (Boston Red Sox, 2010).

The concept of authenticity is likely related to how many people feel about Fenway's future. From the most conservative to the most radical dispositions, all agree that the facility is historically significant. However, it appears there are a number of differing views on what constitutes "authenticity" that causes debate among the various interest groups (Cohen, 2002). Debates about the commodification of culture often presume that authenticity must lie somewhere outside of and be untouched by the marketplace (Taylor, 1991). This leads to the assumption that authenticity is the inherent property of things or people, ignoring the social conditions, which can influence the actors' concepts of and desire for authentic experiences. Tourism theorists like MacCannell (1976) have suggested that others have focused too heavily on the institutional production of culture and he advocated paying more attention to the experience of authenticity. He sees no need to assume that authentic experiences only exist outside of or away from everyday life. Bruner (2005) adds that no longer is authenticity a property inherent in an object, instead, it is a social process, which is not fixed in time. In the case of the RSN and their temple, Fenway Park, the extensive

social interactions and meanings introduced earlier, may be construed as a socially constructed reality.

Problem Statement

The RSN is a powerful force, not only economically, but also both socially and culturally (Borer, 2008; Demos, 2000). It is an economic force in terms of tourism, as well as spending, by residents on local businesses. It is a social force and an educational force. It has historical and political significance (Nowlin & Ross, 2000). It influences a large number of people on a number of levels, but the attitudes of its members and their implications for the Boston region have not been empirically investigated.

The central problem is to gain a better understanding of how variables such as fan identification, nostalgia, and place bonding are related to attitudes towards the future of Fenway Park. More needs to be explained regarding how Fenway Park influences RSN participation and how a sense of place has developed through this organization. Understanding these relationships has value to researchers as well as team management, and potentially future regional planners.

The aim of this study is to better identify and understand the relationship between strength of fan identification, nostalgia, place bonding, and attitudes about Fenway Park's future. Over the past decade or so, there has been considerable debate in and around Boston concerning the fate of Fenway Park. Debates concerning the future of Fenway Park are nothing new in the Boston area, as the idea of replacing the facility has been considered seriously off and on since the late 1960s. Tom Yawkey, who owned the Red Sox from 1933 until his death in 1976, wanted a new stadium to improve revenue and provide more funding to purchase better players (Shaughnessy, 1999).

The building has value on many levels, but in the end, it might be economic considerations which lead to its demise. Of course, the building will need replacing someday, but when and how it is replaced are not decisions that should be taken lightly because decisions will affect the citizens of the Boston region and beyond in many ways. Understanding people's place attachment as it relates to Fenway Park, how people feel about this issue, and why they feel the way they do is an important step in the process of making informed decisions for the city and team ownership as they move forward in this process. These findings will also contribute to the body of knowledge by examining place bonding as it relates to a sporting facility, a topic rarely explored.

In practical terms, the results of this research will allow the Red Sox organization's marketing department, team owners, and Boston tourism marketers to better understand the feelings of RSN members and to make better-informed decisions regarding Fenway Park and how it might be better managed and marketed. The results will contribute to the overall body of literature through a unique examination of the interaction between place attachment/bonding, fan identification, and nostalgia at an iconic sport site.

Much of the existing literature on sports fans in the United States has focused predominantly on college sports, as opposed to professional sports (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Hocking, 1992; Madrigal, 1995; Wann & Dolan, 1994; Wann, Royalty & Roberts, 2000). Sport research needs to be expanded to include professional sports fans. In executing this expansion, one needs to make certain that the difference between fan and spectator is not ambiguous or confusing. Any definition of "sport fan" should revolve around the concept of perceived interest, as well as the personal

importance of sports to the individual (Shank & Beasley, 1998). Jones (1997) adds that for a fan, the affiliation will have a great deal of emotional significance value associated with group membership. For clarification purposes, members of the RSN will be classified as fans, not spectators, as they tend to place a high importance on sports and make considerable emotional investments in the team.

Conceptual Framework

Relph (1976) posited that attachment to place grows through the accumulation of experiences associated with a location. Jorgensen and Stedman (2001) added to the definition of place attachment by defining it as a strong emotional tie between person and setting that may include meanings, values, symbols, beliefs, or the feelings one associates with a setting. According to Stedman (2002), a more recent school of thought in research involving place attachment posits that when considering attachment to place, one should not presuppose that interactions between social actors are necessary for creating attachment. Attachment can be created through interaction with a physical environment even without the presence of other persons.

The theoretical frameworks used in this research to examine the relationship between the Boston Red Sox and the fans of the RSN are identity theory, nostalgia, and fan identification. After a review of identity theory, fan identity literature is reviewed to define one of the key variables to be measured in this study, after which the nostalgia literature is reviewed.

There are no hard numbers to gauge just how many members of the RSN exist, but much anecdotal evidence suggests that membership is huge, likely over one million (with approximately 4.5 million people living in Greater Boston). In all likelihood, the identity associated with being a member of the RSN is important to many of the region's

citizens. This identity has implications for many Bostonians, such as the future of Fenway Park, regional tourism, and historical preservation, to mention a few. Therefore, a more complete understanding of this identity is crucial to moving forward in a more informed manner.

A social identity is the portion of an individual's self-concept derived from perceived membership in a relevant social group (Burke, 1991). Social identity theory introduced the concept of social identity as a way in which to explain intergroup behavior (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). While identity theory is principally a sociological theory that attempts to explain an individual's role related behaviors, social identity theory is more of a social psychological theory, which attempts to explain inter-group relations.

Identity manifests itself on many levels, one of which is place. Many factors, including social, cultural, and the built environment combine to shape one's identity. When attachment to place grows, we begin to identify ourselves with these places. This process results in self-concepts that are in part based on place (Giuliani, 2003).

Identity theory defines identity as a set of meanings applied to the self in a social role or situation that defines what it means to be who one is (Burke, 1991). Furthermore, commitment influences identity salience, which affects role choice (Borgatta & Borgatta, 1992). Stryker (1968) laid the foundation for how social identity should be understood by positing that identity is based on categorizations that others have for an individual in addition to the individual's acceptance of the categorizations. Furthermore, on a personal level, these identities exist only insofar as the individual participates in social interactions. More recently, Burke (1991) suggested that identities are tied to roles or positions in organized social relationships. Given the hierarchical

organization of identities, the salience of identities will vary in terms of which are most salient at a given point in time. Consequently, self-identity is organized on a salience hierarchy, meaning choices are based on the salience of an identity, which one then positions within an identity hierarchy.

Identification of people and, just as importantly, things in the social world and the subsequent definition of their meanings, is a key component of symbolic interactionism (McCall & Simmons, 1966). Furthermore, identification requires an organized link to others, either in a formal or a symbolic sense. Social identity theory suggests identities are tied to group memberships (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). In addition, upon joining a group, an individual will often think of that group as superior to any other group, enhancing their own self-image (Tajifel, 1981).

Although much of this earlier research dealt with how one related with other people, as well as with one's self, more recent research has focused on the bonds that people form with places where they participate in active recreation (Brown & Raymond, 2007). This study examines if these feelings of attachment are transferable to places where people engage in passive recreation and uses this concept of bonding with a place as a measure of attachment to a place, in this case Fenway Park. Given the importance of Fenway Park to the RSN and the Boston region, an understanding of the place bonding that is associated with the facility is crucial to understanding why people react the way they do to it and what the future might hold for the stadium.

Further underscoring the importance of this relationship is the supposition that this place bonding also contributes to the nostalgic feelings that people often have for places. In turn, these nostalgic feelings influence one's place bonding towards a specific

place and the identity that this place holds for them. Snyder (1991) suggested that the visitation of nostalgic venues, such as halls of fame and museums, could be viewed as a form of socialization in which artifacts and the memories people attach to them symbolically convey the values and norms of a society. Segrave (2001) added to this train of thought by positing that these so-called “cathedrals” of sports allow people to connect with a more social sense of who they are both as individuals and as members of a society. He further noted that sports do not just take place anywhere and that these sites become culturally significant places that are celebrated as repositories of history, folklore, and sentiment. Segrave’s research indicates social and psychological elements are often encompassed by nostalgia.

In the case of Fenway Park, it is beneficial to understand how nostalgia and place bonding are related to beliefs as to what the future of Fenway Park should be, but one must be careful not to overlook the fan identification variable, also. Given the obsessive nature of many RSN fans, to ignore fan identification would call into question findings based only on place bonding and nostalgia. Wann (1997) defines sports fan team identification as a fan's psychological connection with and attachment to a team. Fans normally report highly consistent levels of identification from season to season. It appears that an individual’s level of identification with a particular team or player remains relatively stable from season to season (Wann 2001; Wann & Schrader 1996). The social/psychological nature of this connection and its continuity from year to year make sports team identification an excellent variable to explore how it interacts with nostalgia, a psychologically based variable, and place bonding, which deals with feelings established over time.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of Greater Boston residents towards the future of Fenway Park. Specifically, this study examined how varying levels of fan identification, place bonding, and nostalgia affected perceptions of future options for modifying Fenway Park.

Research Questions

The first research question in the study is “what are the attitudes of Greater Boston residents toward future modifications of Fenway Park?” This is followed by a three two-part questions. Research question 2a “What are the levels of fan identification among Greater Boston residents?” and 2b “Are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents towards future modifications of Fenway Park and level of fan identification?” are followed by research question 3a “What is the level of nostalgia among Greater Boston residents with regards to Fenway Park?” and 3b “Are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents towards future modifications of Fenway Park and the level of nostalgia?” The final research questions are 4a “What is the level of place bonding to Fenway Park among Greater Boston residents?” and 4b “Are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents towards future modifications of Fenway Park and the five dimensions of place bonding?”

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The following chapter provides a review of literature that is relevant to the current research. It begins by placing the proposed research in a more in-depth historical context than the brief overview in the Chapter 1. Fan identity literature is reviewed to define one of the key variables. Fan loyalty literature is used to link the concepts of fan identification to baseball. The history and importance of Fenway Park is reviewed to provide an in-depth understanding of the sense of community that links the Boston area with its beloved baseball team. Lastly, the literature concerning nostalgia sports tourism is reviewed to associate nostalgia with attitudes regarding future modifications of Fenway Park and place bonding.

Historical Context

Boston as a city is somewhat of a paradox. It is home to a number of innovative research facilities, but it is also a city that holds a deep attachment to its history. Boston not only respects its history, but also frequently fights hard to ensure its preservation (Holleran, 1998). This dynamic city, which embraces its past while simultaneously striving to be a leader in the modern technologies industry and desiring to present itself as a modern city, is the backdrop for this research. For all of its forward looking ambitions, the city of Boston cannot escape its past, nor would it want to. The people of the Boston region are also very proud of their past. Boston is known for many things in regards to its sport city image. To some, it is known as the Athens of America (Hardy, 2003). To some, it is known as a racist city that does not like its star athletes to be black (Bryant, 2002). To others, it is known for the arrogance of its fans (Vaccaro, 2005). To truly understand the passion that Boston sports fans feel for their teams and pride that

they take in the success of these teams, one should understand what motivates members of the RSN.

Fenway Park

Fenway Park, located in the Kenmore Square area of Boston, was built in 1912, and is now the oldest ballpark in Major League Baseball. The first Major League game took place at the ballpark April 20, 1912, with the Red Sox defeating the New York Highlanders. The event would have made front-page news had it not been for the sinking of the *Titanic* a few days before. Despite numerous renovations, several historic pieces of the park remain intact. For example, the Green Monster wall with its famous hand operated scoreboard was added to the facility in 1934. This manually operated scoreboard is used to post the score-by-innings, as well as out of town scores, one of the few in baseball that are still changed manually. A few years later, 1940, bullpens were constructed in right field to bring the fence 23 feet closer to home plate, to benefit the team's left handed super star, Ted Williams. The new bullpens appropriately became known as Williamsburg (Dame, 1994).

The ball club installed sky view seats at Fenway Park in 1946. Lights followed in 1947, and Fenway's first message board was added over the centerfield bleachers in 1976. In 1988-89, stadium club seats were constructed above the grandstand behind home plate — where the former press box was located. Before the 2003 season, a seating section was constructed on top of the Green Monster. Besides the Green Monster and the manual scoreboard, Fenway features many other unique elements that are well known to baseball fans nationwide, including Pesky's pole in right field, the lone red seat in deep right field, and the infamous triangle in center field. Other than those additions, Fenway Park for the most part is unchanged. With its manually operated

scoreboard, its geometrically peculiar shape (including the only ladder in play in the majors), Fenway remains a link to baseball's past. However, it also remains an important aspect of the city's culture and economic landscapes (Ross, 2004). For a summary of changes made to Fenway Park since 1946, see Appendix C.

At its core, Fenway Park is very much the same facility that opened its doors in 1912. Its architectural idiosyncrasies and the crowd's close proximity to the field are part of Fenway Park's unique charm. Some critics contend that the facility is outdated and uncomfortable, while its supporters contend that its familiarity is a part of its charm. Fenway Park opened in April 1912, with the Red Sox winning the World Series their first year playing in Fenway Park. The Red Sox also won the World Series in 1915, 1916, and 1918 before falling into a long period of mediocrity. It would be 86 years before they won another World Series in 2004. Despite this prolonged championship drought, the Red Sox managed to build one of the most dedicated fan bases in professional sports.

According to Nowlin and Desrochers (2007), Boston's love affair with the Red Sox arguably began in 1967 during the impossible dream season, but the period from 1974 to 1978 cemented the Red Sox as an integral part of Boston's culture and Fenway Park as hallowed ground. During the 1970s, the hockey team, the Bruins, and the basketball team, the Celtics, also achieved much notoriety and won their respective top sport awards and championships several times. Yet, in the short span of three years, Fenway Park hosted two of the most memorable baseball games ever played. On October 21, 1975, Fenway Park hosted game six of the 1975 World Series between the Boston Red Sox and the Cincinnati Reds, and won the game. Many baseball fans and historians consider this the greatest World Series game ever played, if not the greatest baseball

game ever played. This World Series was so pivotal for Major League Baseball that a number of baseball historians have credited it with reinvigorating the nation's interest in baseball and saving the sport from continuing its downward slide in popularity among American sports fans (Nowlin, 2005). On October 4, 1978, Fenway Park hosted a one game play off between the Boston Red Sox and their hated rivals, the New York Yankees. Many baseball experts contend that this second game was the greatest baseball game ever played (Bradley, 2008). Regardless of which one should be considered the greatest baseball game ever played, the fact that Fenway Park hosted both games within a three-year span suggests that during that time-period, Fenway Park and the Boston Red Sox were at the center of Major League Baseball's universe.

Since the epic games played in the late seventies, the Red Sox have managed to maintain one of the most knowledgeable and devoted fan bases in any professional sport (Burke, 2010). The Red Sox played in only one World Series between the 1975 appearance and 2004, yet their fans remained devoted. It is possible that the sense of place that they felt for Fenway Park or the nostalgia that they felt for the facility and the sense of community that these great games inspired are part of what kept the fan base loyal and rabid. The team made the play offs every couple of years between 1975 and 2004, but was never considered a serious contender to win the World Series (Golenbock, 2005). Despite this, their fan base remained loyal, much more loyal than the team's win-loss record merited.

Stadiums as Urban Identity

Historians have found the linkage between baseball and the development of American urban centers to be a strong one. Hardy (2003) posited that baseball was instrumental in shaping how American cities developed as their populations surged in

the late 19th century. Hardy suggests that understanding baseball's role is crucial to understanding the development of Boston in particular. To overlook historical implications on the relationship between nostalgia and baseball would be an error.

Many professional sports teams have enthusiastic fans, but among many people working in professional baseball, Red Sox fans are considered the most knowledgeable and passionate (Frost, 2009). The media coverage in Boston is considered the most intense in all of baseball by the players (Gorman, 2005). Burke (2010) concluded, based on empirical findings, that the RSN were the most dedicated and loyal sports fans in any professional sports league in America. Something about the Fenway Park experience has managed to trump the usual main draw for fans, the winning of championships. According to hall of fame journalist Peter Gammons (2010), out of all fine sporting traditions in the city of Boston, it is a city that reveres baseball above all other sports.

Many literary giants, including John Updike, Dave Halberstam, and Stephen King have chronicled the experience at Fenway Park. One can argue that the main reason Fenway Park is still in operation is the significance that so many people place on it as an important place in their lives. Regardless of whether one's participation at Fenway Park involved private or shared experiences, they have given the meanings of Fenway Park an almost objective reality, a presence outside of the hearts and minds of a given individual. This meaning attributed to Fenway Park has become what Emile Durkeim would call a social fact (Thompson, 2002). Fenway Park is as much a symbol of Boston as the Old North Church or Faneuil Hall. While economics plays a role in determining

Fenway Park's value to Boston, economic models alone cannot measure the cultural value the site is accorded by Red Sox fans and New Englanders alike.

There are many shareholders with a stake in the Fenway Park debate, as the economic impact of the facility is far reaching in the region. Sport tourism is an important part of Boston's economy. Dann (1994) advocated that the quest to capture the past is seen as superior to experiencing the present by many tourists. Fenway Park and similar historic ball fields (e.g., Wrigley Field, Lambeau Field, etc.) offer sports fans the opportunity to travel back in time. Despite some renovations, the main features have remained unchanged throughout its history. Having been featured on television for a number of historic games, its characteristics are famous even to sports fans who have never attended a game there. But in addition to being famous among baseball fans, it is a famous landmark in Boston. Participants on Fenway Park tours are told that the stadium is the most visited tourist attraction in Boston. As a result of this unique history, a strong sense of community has developed between the RSN and the Boston Red Sox, and Fenway Park sits at the middle of this relationship. Thus, understanding the role that Fenway Park plays in this complex relationship is vital to gaining a better understanding of the role of the fans' sense of place and urban identity.

Part of what make Fenway Park and Wrigley Field so unique is the changing trend in baseball facility design that began in the late 1960s, with a trend towards larger bowl shaped facilities that were often designed for multiple uses. A number of stadiums constructed during the 1970s were designed to support both baseball and football teams. Due to the need for the stadiums to host football games, the seating capacity was often much larger than what was needed for baseball games (John, Sheard, &

Vickery, 2007). Many of these facilities were round in shape and referred to as donut stadiums and most were not easily distinguishable from each other due to the similar designs. Since the 1990s, the trend has been to build smaller single use facilities for baseball teams, with Camden Yards in Baltimore and Jacobs Field in Cleveland being prime examples of this trend. The newer more intimate ballparks often cite a desire to be more like Fenway Park and Wrigley Field (John, Sheard, & Vickery, 2007). Further trends in facility design include as many luxury boxes as possible, improved concession areas, improved handicap access, and wider concourses. Fenway has upgraded existing facilities, but there is no room at Fenway Park for designers to incorporate any of these trends.

Sports Fans

Wann (2001) suggests that in order to understand the behaviors of spectators in a society, one must understand the relationship between sports fandom and that society. According to Wann, sports fandom can potentially be linked to a number of functionalist imperatives in society, including but not limited to: producing social capital, contributing to the socialization process, enhancing integration at all levels, assisting in social control, and serving as a form of religion.

Sports fan team identification is defined as a fan's psychological connection with and attachment to a team (Wann, 1997). Despite the "identification" label, the concept of "team identification" does not necessarily imply that fans take on the identity of the group. Emotional attachment to a team is better explained as a one-sided para-social interaction with the team than as strictly defined "identification" with the whole group.

The extent to which people are interested in and follow sports teams varies greatly, ranging from occasionally watching a televised game or attending a live event,

to owning season tickets or watching as many games as possible. One possible result of a strong connection to a sports team is that one might feel a sense of personal success when the team wins and a sense of loss when the team loses (Cialdini et al., 1976). The growth and interest in research on sports spectators and fans has been grounded in a multi-disciplinary approach drawing theoretically from sociology, psychology, consumer behavior, and marketing (Funk, & James, 2001). Understanding the relationship between spectators or fans and sports teams continues to be a relevant research topic for numerous reasons, including economics, marketing, and community building.

Wann (1997) differentiates between sports fans and sports spectators by classifying a fan as somebody who is interested in and follows a sport, team, or athlete, while a spectator is an individual who actively witnesses sporting events. Witnessing may be in person or through some form of media. He further posits that viewing a game does not necessarily indicate that the person is attached to either team in any way. In the case of Boston Red Sox followers, one must be cautious not to place too much

emphasis on watching games in person when considering level of fanship, as tickets are expensive and hard to acquire (Klein, 2009).

Luckily, for researchers who are interested in studying fan identification, research indicates that team identification is not a function of the outcome of a team's most recent game (Lieberman, 1991). Instead, fans normally report highly consistent levels of identification from game to game, even from season to season. It appears that an individual's level of identification with a particular team or player remains relatively

stable from game to game and from season to season (Wann 2000; Wann & Schrader 1996).

Fans with lower levels of team identification tend to view their role as a follower of the team as a peripheral component of their self-concept (Wann, 2001), while highly identified fans often view the team as a reflection of themselves, in some cases, viewing the team as an extension of themselves as an individual (Tajfel, 1981). These highly identified fans are likely to readily present themselves as a fan of their team to others (Wann, Royalty, & Roberts, 2000). As highly identified fans place increased importance on their team's performance, their behavioral, affective, and cognitive reactions tend to become more extreme (Wann & Schrader, 1997).

One of the most popular means of measuring this aforementioned attachment is an attempt to measure team identification by Wann and Branscombe (1993), who developed the Sport Spectator Identification Scale (SSIS). This scale has been used successfully worldwide in team identification research (Gayton, Coffin, & Hearns, 1998). The SSIS contains seven items with response options ranging from one to eight, the higher the number, the greater the level of team identification. Respondents answer the seven questions and their scores are summed. According to Wann, (1997), scores less than 18 indicate a low level of identification, while scores greater than 35 suggest a high level of identification. Scores falling in the 18 to 35 range are considered moderately identified.

In addition to this research involving the SSIS, other research has suggested that there are many reasons a fan may initially identify with a particular team, but a few of the reasons are more prominent than others. Wann, Tucker, and Schrader (1996)

found one of the most influential factors was support for the team by one's parents. The talent and characteristics of the players was also an important factor. Geographical reasons were tied with the influence of one's friends as the third most prominent reason for identifying with a particular team. Interestingly, the success of the team was only the fifth most mentioned reason for originally identifying with a team, but it ranked as the number one reason for continued support of a team. Conversely, lack of success was cited as the number one reason for ending one's identification with a team.

Various scholars have explored in greater detail how fans' level of psychological commitment to a sports team affects their postgame attributions. Wann and his colleagues have posited that highly identified fans exhibit more extreme behaviors in reaction to a favorite team's performance than do those with lower levels of identification (Wann, Melnick, Russell, & Pease, 2001). Focusing on locus of causality, Wann and Dolan (1994) reported that highly identified fans were more apt to attribute a winning effort by a preferred team to internal causes, such as players' efforts or fan support, and a losing effort to external causes such as poor referees or fate. This research lends credence to the notion of a self-serving bias, but suggests that such an effect is most pronounced for those who are most highly identified with the team. These findings on locus of control were replicated in a later study by Wann and Schrader (2000). In this study, the authors also examined the extent to which the attributions of controllability and stability were moderated by team identification. Consistent with a self-serving bias, they reported that highly identified fans were more likely to attribute a win to controllable and stable causes than were lower identified fans.

These findings by Wann and Schrader (2000) were disputed by more recent research. End, et al. (2003) examined how game outcome affects the type of attributions that fans and rival fans generate in a computer-mediated medium. They randomly selected 164 attributions for a team's performance that were posted on a sports magazine's message board and coded them along with the dimensions of locus, controllability, and stability. Counter to Wann and Schrader's findings implying a self-serving bias, their results suggested that fans were more likely to attribute their team's victories to external, stable, and uncontrollable factors, and losses to internal, unstable, and controllable attributions. End, et al., concluded that the pattern of effects found in their study implies that self-presentation motives and social norms influence fans' attributions. Yet, data from rival fans were more consistent with a self-serving bias than were the data from fans. Thus, their results are not only counter to those reported by Wann and Schrader, but it also appears that they might be internally inconsistent.

Research by Cialdini, et al. (1976), supports the suggestion that many sports fans link their self-esteem to success or failure of their favorite teams. Two important concepts relating to this practice are: basking in reflected glory (BIRGing) and satisfaction with team performance. Consistent with balance theory (Heider, 1958), fans enhance their own esteem in the eyes of others by communicating their affiliation with a team whose actions they consider praiseworthy. Cialdini, et al., suggest that fans may demonstrate BIRGing behavior in a variety of ways using the first-person pronoun "we" rather than "they" when referring to their team, and wearing clothing displaying the team's logo. In direct contrast, fans seeking to distance themselves from a team that is judged to be blameworthy will employ an image-protection technique referred to as

cutting off reflected failure or CORFing. In a similar vein, social identity theory posits that individuals strive for a positive self-concept, with social behavior varying along a continuum between interpersonal behavior and intergroup behavior. In-group favoritism is an effect where people give preferential treatment to others when they are perceived to be in the same in-group. Social identity attributes the cause of in-group favoritism to a psychological need for a positive self-concept (Tajfel, 1981). This concept is very similar to the concept of BIRGing.

Continuing the efforts of these researchers to explain the motivations of sports fans, Trail and James (2001) developed the Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption (MSCC) to measure the motivations behind sports spectator consumption behavior. They felt that previous efforts to develop scales to measure spectator motives demonstrated weaknesses in content, criterion, and construct validity. Specifically, they argued that the SFMS scale presented by Wann, et al. (1999), had problems in the areas of content validity, discriminant validity, criterion validity, and to some extent, convergent validity. Although their results showed that the MSCC demonstrated the best psychometric properties overall to accurately and reliably measure motivations of

sports spectator consumption behavior, the scale is not specifically designed to measure sports fan identity.

Funk and James (2001) present a model that categorized the different levels of fan connection to a team. The Psychological Continuum Model (PCM) specified the general parameters in which a relationship between an individual, sport or athlete is mediated. Within the PCM framework, the object-related connection (e.g., a sport or team) was considered interchangeable. Much of the discussion, however, was devoted to college

athletic teams. Four general stages operating along a vertical continuum were conceptualized to characterize the various psychological connections that sports spectators and fans may form with specific sports and teams. They were presented as follows: the initial level, awareness, denotes when an individual first learns that certain sports, and/or teams exist, but does not have a specific favorite. The second level, attraction, indicates when an individual acknowledges having a favorite team or favorite sport based on various social-psychological and demographic-based motives. On the third level, attachment, a psychological connection forms creating various degrees of association between the individual and the sport object (e.g., a favorite team). Attachment represents the degree or strength of association based on the perceived importance attached to physical and psychological features associated with a team or sport. Finally, on the fourth level, allegiance, an individual has become a loyal (or committed) fan of the sport or team. Allegiance results in influential attitudes that produce consistent and durable behaviors.

These four stages represent the degree to which a person is attached to a team. Additionally, there are many reasons why individuals may feel the need to be a part of a group in order to be recognized for their support. Individuals may derive strength and a sense of identity from their connections to social groups (Fisher & Wakefield, 1998). The degree to which a membership or affiliation affects self-identity is defined by the strength of the individual's group identification, with stronger identification leading the individual to attribute desirable characteristics of the group to the self, and to assume a greater similarity with other group members (Fisher & Wakefield, 1998; Tajfel, 1981). The key term here is similar characteristics. The need to feel a connection with a social

group that has like characteristics is the attraction that brings individuals to join fan bases.

Although one must be cautious when generalizing about demographics and personality traits of sports fans, research has suggested some very broad parameters rooted in this similar characteristic approach. Numerous studies have found that sport fans are disproportionately likely to be male (Lieberman 1991; Wann 1998; Zuckerman 1984). Pan and Baker (1999) found sports fandom to be positively correlated with socioeconomic status. Wann (1998) found that neither tobacco nor alcohol usage was associated with any level of fanship.

Much of the research dealing with the motivations of sports fans is complicated by the possibility that the motivations may differ by sport or type of sport. Wann, Grieve, Zapalac, and Pease (2008) found differing motivations for team identification for different sports, as well as for different types of sports. They classified sports into three different dichotomies: individual (e.g., figure skating, golf) versus team (e.g., professional baseball, college basketball); aggressive (e.g., professional wrestling, professional football) versus nonaggressive (e.g., professional baseball, figure skating); and stylistic (e.g., figure skating, gymnastics) versus non-stylistic (e.g., professional hockey, tennis). They found that aesthetic motivation was particularly prominent in individual sports, while scores were greater for team sports in eustress, self-esteem, group affiliation, entertainment, and family. Aesthetic motivation scores were also high in nonaggressive sports, while economic, eustress, group affiliation, and entertainment were higher for team sports. Finally, aesthetic motivation was quite high for stylistic

sports, while economic, eustress, self-esteem, group affiliation, entertainment, and family motivation scores were higher for non-stylistic sports.

Wann, et al. (2008), posited that understanding motivations was a critical part of understanding the strength of and reasoning behind why fans identified with teams the way they did. This research was a continuation of his earlier work, as it was based on Wann's (1995) Sport Fan Motivation Scale (SFMS), which highlights eight motivations, including eustress (positive stress or arousal, stress release), escapism (diversion from daily life), entertainment, aesthetic pleasure (the beauty of sport performances), group affiliation, family needs (spending time with family), potential economic gain (gambling), and self-esteem (personal enhancement). The current study is concerned with two of the underpinning dimensions, based in social identity theory, proposed by Wann for fan motivations: psychological and social belonging (Wann, 1997).

Psychological Motives

Wann (2008), suggests an understanding of psychological motives may assist a researcher in being able to examine such psychologically related concepts as sense of place and nostalgia. Sports fans seek fulfillment of various emotional and intellectual needs through the consumption of sport, on which basis researchers classify different fan types and their level of identification based on psychological motives. Psychological motives can also be defined as those factors concerned with the individual interest and enjoyment extracted from an activity (Wann, Schrader, & Wilson, 1999). Identified motives include:

Eustress: The human need for positive stress and psychological arousal is often referred to as eustress (Wann, 1995). Wann, et al. (1999), suggest that the high levels of action played out in team competition provide a high degree of stimulation for

spectators. At a more complex level, the stimulation sports offer provides a departure from the concerns of daily life.

Escape: The stimulation and arousal provided by sports also acts as an antidote to the routine ordinariness of everyday life in highly organized, but “unexciting societies” (Elias & Dunning, 1970). Some researchers go as far as to suggest that for many fans, watching sports is the ultimate escape experience (Cohen & Taylor, 1992; Fink, Trail, & Anderson, 2002).

Aesthetic pleasure: Sports watching can offer aesthetic pleasure to fans. For many fans, one of the main attractions of sport is its ability to constantly provide memorable moments that are stored in the collective memory. Using a developed version of Lacan’s idea of the “Gaze,” Urry (2002) suggested that the “tourist gaze” is constantly reinterpreted; often being driven by the sheer novelty of the visual space a tourist encounters (Carrier, 1986). In this sense, the “sporting gaze” can deliver ongoing aesthetic pleasure for the avid observer, despite apparent repetition.

Drama and entertainment: Sports watching may also provide entertainment and drama (Fink et al., 2002; Sloan, 1979; Stewart & Nicholson, 2003; Wilson, 1999). An attractive blend of performance, theatre, emblems, and noise allows consumers to capture an intense experience of drama and entertainment (Crawford, 2004). In their study of college football fans in the United States, Gibson, Willming, and Holdnak (2003) drew attention to the importance of “tailgating,” reinforcing that entertainment for sports fans need not be confined to the sporting arena.

Social Belonging Motives

While psychological and socio-cultural motives help describe why a fan is attracted to a sport object, it is clear that not all fans experience the same degree or strength of

identification. The degree to which a fan identifies with a team is an important issue, since it may predict their loyalty and their subsequent travel behavior (Fink, et al., 2002). Fans with stronger identification have sports more deeply embedded in their self-concept, and are more likely to attend games and travel greater distances to do so, purchase merchandise, spend more on tickets and products, and remain loyal (Fink, et al.; Murrel & Dietz, 1992; Wann & Branscombe, 1993). Motives that contribute to social belonging are likely to be the most salient to team identification (Fink, et al.). The more closely an individual associates their sense of self with a team, and the more self-esteem they extract from that teams' successes, the greater their degree of emotional attachment, and the more committed they will be to engaging with the team wherever they play.

Emotional attachment to a group is a commonly accepted concept in many branches of science. One form of social belonging used to re-live or capture ancient ceremonies and primitive social practices is tribal connections which is also manifested in sports fandom. For example, Morris (1981) argued that contemporary sports are the modern counterpart of ancient hunting patterns. Rituals may include pre-game activities, costumes in team colors and the location of team related signs. The players are the tribal heroes, cheered and lauded as they perform on the field of play. Central to the tribal practices are the fans, or tribal followers, who accentuate inter-tribal rivalries through the purchase of memorabilia or dressing in club colors. They also construct tribal chants and team songs, which are used not only to assert their identity, but also to intimidate rival tribes and declare their affiliations long before arrival at the site of the sport contest (Morris, 1981).

Vicarious achievement and self-esteem: The other dimension of belonging comes through the opportunity fans have to associate with a successful team in order to pretend that they, too, are successful (Cialdini et al., 1976). The depth and intensity of the identification can vary significantly. At one end of the intensity continuum are the "fair-weather" fans whose identity is directly linked to team victories, and whose attendance at events will waver based on the team's success. In Boston, these fair weather fans are referred to derisively as "pink hats." At the other end are the passionate supporters whose lifestyle and values are tightly aligned to their favorite teams, even when success is infrequent (Sutton, Sutton, McDonald, Milne, & Cimperman, 1997). Through their association with a successful team, individual fans can extract a sense of social status and self-esteem (Trail, Anderson, & Fink, 2000). The vicarious achievement motive parallels the self-esteem motive popularized by Wann (1995), which referred to the desire to preserve a positive self-concept through a team's successes.

Place Attachment/Bonding

Among the members of the RSN, there exists a strong social connectedness to place as well as a high level of fan identification with the team. What is not known is the role that place bonding, as it relates to Fenway Park, plays among Bostonians. The complex history that helped shape Boston's sense of place, particularly in regard to Fenway Park and the Boston Red Sox is an important part of understanding how place bonding factors into the equation.

Place attachment has been defined and interpreted by various fields; consequently, the definition and interpretations have varied according to the practical applications and subject matter of each field. For a number of years, leisure research

considered places as commodities. A place was considered to be the sum of its functional attributes (Williams & Vaske, 2003). The current prevailing view of place among social scientists is more complex, and has been expanded to take into consideration individualized and unique qualities, including relationships that people have formed with places. These relationships may be deeply meaningful to the user of the place and hold great value in their lives (Moore & Scott, 2003). Currently, resource managers and researchers view sense of place as an important concept in understanding how to provide better recreational experiences, as well as when trying to understand the public's reaction to management decisions.

Williams and Vaske (2003) suggest that although some studies have shown that the most frequently used measures of place identity and place dependence correlate very highly, there is sufficient evidence to retain them as separate constructs. Place identity is most commonly defined in terms of how one views one's self in relation to an environment, while place dependence normally refers to connections built specifically on activities that take place in a recreational setting. Kyle and Manning (2005) concluded that most standardized measures used to assess place attachment in both recreation and tourism are composed of place dependence and place attachment scales.

Despite the many subtle differences in the existing definitions of place attachment, the vast majority agrees that it is multifaceted in nature and comprised of both internal and external factors. Altman and Low (1992) posited that there is a biological component, which influences the attachment of people to places. Kaltenborn and Bjerke (2002) found support for a biological predisposition to developing attachment to

certain types of scenery. Herzog and Herbert (2000) offer support for some place preferences being innate, as their findings showed more similarities than differences when comparing landscape preferences across cultures. Even with these findings suggesting support for innate responses to certain environmental features, it appears place attachment is a much more complex concept than these innate responses can explain.

Other research suggests a complex interaction between causes, an interaction between personal and sociocultural factors (Hunt 1975; Gartner 1989; Echtner & Ritchie 1993, the consensus being that place attachment can form from individual as well as shared social processes. Place attachment studies in recreation and tourism tend to approach the research on the level of the individual in terms of cognition, affect, and behavior (Backlund & Williams, 2003). Stedman (2003) posits that this focus on the individual is justified if one accepts that personal experiences mold the meaning of place. He points to a long tradition in the place attachment literature, which supports the contention that over the life course, repeated experiences lead to a strengthening of attachment to a particular place. This includes the tendency to develop emotional ties as a result of this process. Sense of place research supports the contention that place attachment is determined by more than innate preferences alone, as factors such as geographic proximity and number of visits are also contributing factors (Long & Perkins, 2007).

This diversity within and among place variables has been recognized in earlier place research (Altman & Low 1992; Bonnes & Secchiaroli 1995; Giulaini & Feldman 1993). This earlier research identified the diversity of place attachment definitions as an

important challenge to further progress in the field. Altman and Low posit that it would be useful to strengthen the definition of place attachment while considering it within the broad framework of the multiple affective, cognitive, and behavioral relationships between people and socio-physical environments. Giuliani and Feldman identified the diversity of place attachment definitions as an important challenge to further progress in the field. Similarly, Low and Altman considered the range of place attachment definitions in the literature and noted that one consistently defining aspect of the concept was its emotional quality. However, they did not overemphasize this quality, but rather they pointed to a general trend in the field that argued that place attachment also includes cognition and behaviors. They concluded that place attachment involves an interplay of affect and emotions, knowledge and beliefs, and behaviors and actions in reference to a given place.

When place attachment researchers want to identify links between place attachment and particular behaviors, it is important that they highlight the cognitive (beliefs and perceptions), affective (emotions and feelings), and cognitive (behavioral intentions and commitments) domains (Millar & Tesser, 1992). They further emphasize that attitude research should distinguish between *instrumental* and *consummatory* behaviors. The former are driven by attitudes that have a strong cognitive basis and refer to behaviors that are a means to an end. The latter, consummatory behaviors are motivated by attitudes that are predominantly emotional in content and are performed for their own sake, enjoyment, or interest (Wilson, Dunn, Kraft, & Lisle, 1989). In general, Millar and Tesser (1989) concluded that attitudes toward some objects may be

based more on cognition, while attitudes toward other objects, such as consumer purchases may be more affect-based.

Informed by these multidimensional views, Jorgensen and Stedman (2001) examined the cognitive, affective, and conative structure of place attachment in their survey of shoreline property owners in northern Wisconsin. Their findings were consistent with previous findings which posited that place identity was partly conceived as representing beliefs that the self was defined in relation to one's lakeshore property. Their findings suggested that place attachment was defined in terms of positive feelings about one's property, while place dependence concerned the behavioral advantage of one's lake property relative to other settings. Their results supported multidimensionality in place attachment, but also provided strong evidence for a considerable amount of variation across measured place constructs. They found that while some variation was unique to each place construct, there was a large degree of overlap among the constructs at the empirical level. In addition, their empirical evidence suggested that place attachment, when defined as a general attitude toward a place, was marginally more affect-based than either conative or cognitive-based. Their findings are generally consistent with research in social psychology that has demonstrated some discriminant validity among the cognitive, affective, and conative components of attitude (Breckler, 1984).

Moore and Scott (2003) found place attachment to sites is higher among those living close to the site. They posited that these findings were the result of higher levels of direct site experiences. Williams and Vaske (2003) offer support for the contention that place attachments strengthen as visitation increases.

Despite evidence suggesting that individual characteristics and personal experiences play a key role in the development of place attachment, the impact of social influences on place attachment should not be ignored. Kyle and Manning (2005) posit that place attachment is often thought to have developed as a function of social relationships which take place in a given location. Many studies in the sociological tradition place the emphasis for place attachment on the shared nature of the experience. Much of the focus has been on the social processes by which meanings come to be created and shared, or even imposed (Gieryn, 2000). This sociological perspective tends to define place in terms of shared meanings and symbols (Yung, Freimund, & Belsky, 2003). This emphasis on the shared aspects of sense of place is especially strong among researchers influenced by social interactionism (Stokowski, 2002).

There is disagreement among tourism researchers about the need for direct experience with a place to occur for place attachment to form. Researchers with a geography background advocate that direct experience is critical, perhaps even essential, for place attachment to form (Clark & Stein, 2003). Stedman (2003) concurs, positing that personal experience is the key element that transforms space into a place. Proponents of the sociocultural perspective, however, contend that a direct experience with a place is not required for an attachment to develop. Blake (2002) posits that a place can have cultural, symbolic meanings which can be shared by groups regardless of direct experience with the place. Similarly, Schroeder (2007) found that people exhibited attachment to places that were not even “real” representations of an actual place. His findings suggest that people were attached to imagined places or idealized

versions of a place. These findings suggest that one's contact with a place may be more of a psychological process than a physical interaction.

There is empirical evidence supporting this psychologically based place attachment. The evidence does not discount the importance of direct experience with a place, but it does call into question how much of an impact direct contact has in the formulation of attachment to a place. Stedman (2002) found that direct experience with a place accounts for a mere 5% to 10% of the variance in place meanings. Empirical evidence suggests that strong place attachment can develop for places one has visited frequently, but there is also empirical evidence suggesting strong bonds can be formed towards places one has never experienced in person. Thus, place attachment appears to be a complex concept, as it may be both generalized and specific; it seems to vary as a function of context, as well as cultural and individual factors.

One reason place attachment is considered so important to the tourism industry is the contention that different users/nonusers will differ in their levels of place attachment. Knowing about and understanding such differences are beneficial to managers in anticipating and avoiding use conflicts (Cheng, Kruger, & Daniels, 2003). Consequently, it is very helpful to compare different types of users in terms of their place attachments, particularly local versus non-local attachments. Research suggests that locals have more complex understandings and attachments to specific places, as well as more intense place attachments than non-locals (Bonaiuto, Carrus, Martorella, & Bonnes, 2002). Gross and Brown (2008) found that a combination of involvement and place attachment is applicable to tourism research. They further posited that this combination

allowed for the application of concepts originally developed in leisure and recreation contexts in tourism contexts.

The relationship between one's level of involvement and place attachment is another factor that needs to be considered when investigating place attachment. Wann (2000) posits that involvement is an indicator of attachment to an activity or a team. Therefore, it makes intuitive sense that increased levels of involvement would lead to increased attachment with a sporting facility, but due to the complex, often site-specific nature of the sense of place, researchers have not yet been able to declare that an increase in involvement leads to stronger place attachment. Moore and Scott (2003) found that the level of involvement was positively related to place attachment, but the predictive value of their model was not strong. Kyle, Absher, and Graefe (2003) found a similar relationship between level of involvement and place attachment, but it was also a weak relationship.

How place attachment affects people's decisions to visit a place is complex. Obvious factors that come to mind include destination image, distance, accessibility, type of activities provided, and social influences (Williams, Patterson, Roggenbuck, & Watson, 1992; Kyle & Chick, 2002; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). These factors may not accurately explain destination choice unless place attachment is considered with them. According to Xiang and Gretzel (2010), the impact of social networks and the media must be taken into account when considering the importance of place attachment as it relates to destination choice. In addition, social networks and the media help shape a destination's image and help potential tourists form a concept of a destination. These media fueled conceptions encourage visitors to arrive at the destination with

preconceived ideas regarding what their experience should be like. In tourism literature, sport tourists' intentions to visit or revisit a destination have been shown to be influenced by their images of both the event and the destination (Chalip & Costa, 2005). They further posited that destination image plays a very important role in a consumer's decision to visit a destination for the first time. Xing and Chalip (2006) found destination image to be a factor in a consumer's decision to re-visit a destination.

Hay (1998) posits that the development of place attachment is strongly influenced by one's residential status. More specifically, he contends that tourists do not develop as strong of an attachment to a place as insiders who are raised in or near a given place. For Hay, place attachment develops over one's lifetime and is part of the wider human developmental process. As a part of this wider process, one's development of place attachment is subject to the social influences of one's region, as well as one's society. Hay contends that periodic physical contact with a place is necessary to maintain place attachment with it. If this periodic physical contact does not occur, Hay asserts that the place attachment will become more nostalgic in character. Hay maintains that this physical proximity is a well-documented requirement as far back as the work of Proshansky, Fabian, and Kaminoff (1983). Using a qualitative longitudinal study, Hay suggests that attachment that is not reinforced by physical contact will weaken. This has implications for a study on attachments to an iconic ball park.

Hammitt, Backlund, and Bixler (2006) suggest that the bond formed between people and places is of a more personal nature, but they concur with Hay (1998) that a strong familiarity is essential for the bonding to occur. They also concur that the process of humans bonding with places is a complex interaction that involves multiple

factors, but emphasize their belief that a strong emotional tie is critical to the bonding process. Guiliani (2003) posits that this strong emotional tie is dynamic in nature and researchers need to take into account that the relationship is not static. This line of thinking agrees with Hammitt, et al. that psychological factors are the key to understanding place attachment and that these factors are fluid throughout one's life span as all psychological factors are. Their research suggests place bonding is a multi-dimensional construct and needs to be examined accordingly, with a focus on the psychological explanations of the developmental process of bonding with recreational or leisure places in one's life. The study conducted here used their concept of place bonding to measure respondent's attachment to place, Fenway Park.

Jorgensen and Stedman (2001) defined place attachment broadly as being the bond between person and a setting and more expansively as encompassing the meaning individuals ascribe to these settings. The definition of place attachment has expanded to include symbols, values, beliefs, meanings, and feelings associated with a setting (Stedman, 2003). Much of the development and expansion of the definition is a result of research in the field of sociology, with sociologists identifying place as an attachment defined by dependence, as well as identity (Williams & Vaske, 2003). Beckley (2003) posits that if attachment to place is based on social relationships more than physical characteristics, physical changes should not cause changes in sentiment.

Jorgenson and Stedman (2001) point out an important difference between place attachment and place dependence, noting that with place dependence, the strength of the association does not necessarily have to be positive. In fact, the association can be negative. They suggest that the recreational or leisure option chosen by an individual

might be the best choice among a number of poor options. They define place dependence as involving how well a setting provides goal achievement given the range of alternatives one has to choose from. According to their definitions, place attachment and place dependence differ in two critical ways. First, place dependence can be negative if it limits the achievements of valued customers. Second, the degree of connection between an individual and a place may be based on a specific behavior instead of being based on a general affect towards that place.

Kyle and Chick (2007) concur, positing that place identity focuses on symbolic and emotional meanings that people ascribe to a setting, often a recreational setting, while place dependence is more related to the functional utility of a setting as a result of its ability to facilitate a desired leisure experience. The suggestion that place meanings are in part socially constructed is an extension of symbolic interactionism. The term “place attachment” can be traced back to Low and Altman (1992). They used the term to refer to the general phenomena of people bonding with places. They advocated that while affect and emotion are critical to the concept, they also stressed that the emotional elements are normally accompanied by both practice and cognition.

Jorgenson and Stedman (2001) expanded upon the line of research by positing that place attachment is one of the components of the broader concept of sense of place. Drawing on attitude theory, they conceptualized sense of place as consisting of affective, cognitive, and conative components. They used a conceptualization of sense of place that focused on describing the affective relationship between people and a given landscape. Kyle and Chick (2007) suggest that despite the tendency of researchers to divide the elements of place bonding into several components, research

has suggested the components are tightly interwoven. Although the strength of different components varies in different contexts, the strong emotional ties between people and places, remains key to understanding attachment to places. They concluded by positing that the emotions that are central components of sense of place are normally the product of repeated experiences and interactions with a place. Hays (1998), adds to this the suggestion that most meaningful place experiences occur in the presence of people that are significant in their lives.

Much leisure research focuses on meanings people associate with particular leisure experiences. Kyle and Chick examined articles published in major leisure journals relating to human-place relationships and identified three issues for concern. They suggested that the field of leisure studies in general used a narrow conceptualization of human-place bonding, focusing mainly on the place dependence/place identity dichotomy. They further concluded that the phenomena of human-place bonding was examined almost exclusively in the natural resources context and neglected other areas in which human-place bonding takes place in leisure settings. Lastly, they noted a limited amount of work had been conducted examining the process underlying the social construction of place bonding.

Places play an important role in developing and maintaining self-identity and group identity. Proshansky et al. (1983) assert that place attachment is important to a person's well-being in that it reflects “a sense of belonging and purpose which give meaning to his or her life” (p. 90). For members of the RSN, part of their search for this sense of belonging and purpose may be fulfilled by the sense of community that accompanies membership and through the social bonding with the team that membership promotes.

Relph (1976) contends that every person experiences a strong connection with the place where one was born or had significant experiences in. He adds, “This association seems to constitute a vital source of both individual and cultural identity and security” (p. 43).

Psychologists and some social psychologists have drawn on identity theory to examine the influence of places in individual and group identity development, including the importance of places in a person's desire to display or “communicate qualities of the self” to others (Cuba & Hummon, 1993, p.112). In addition, place identities have been studied across vastly different scales of place (Cuba & Hummon; Hidalgo & Hernandez 2001). Past research also demonstrates a relationship between place attachment and attitudes, e.g., attitudes towards Fenway Park (Warzecha & Lime, 2000).

Stedman (2002) noted that “research must deal not only with the strength of attachment but also with the meanings that one attributes to places or the beliefs one has about a spatial setting” (p. 566). Stegner (1992) concurs, describing attachment to a place as a lived experience. Further research supports the concept of place attachment being shaped by lived experience. Hammitt, et al. (2006), posit that these places may come to be depended on not only for their functional purposes, but also for their identification for a specific social group. This is referred to as place dependence and identity.

The multidimensionality of place attachment has been demonstrated by findings that show that theoretically important descriptions of the concept show a significant degree of independence. For example, Jorgenson and Stedman (2002) demonstrated that identity-based beliefs about a place, positive emotions associated with a place, and

behavioral commitments toward a place, were not completely interchangeable variables. This highlights the need to investigate similarities and differences in their relationships with predictor variables. It is possible that multidimensionality will be further understood by observing variations in the relationships between each place dimension and relevant predictor variables. While most of the place attachment literature has focused on outdoor natural settings and general regions, there has been some application of the concept to sports settings (Bale 1991, 1993; Faulk 2006; Trujillo, 1992, 1994).

Research has supported a relationship between visitor benefits and future visitation behavior (Mechinda, Serrirat, & Guild, 2009). More precisely, Mechinda, et al. found novelty to be an important predictor of behavioral loyalty, while Yoon and Uysal (2005) found family cohesion to be an important predictor of behavioral loyalty. In addition, place attachment has been found to play a significant role in predicting behavioral outcomes, such as behavioral loyalty (Lee, Graefe, & Burns, 2007; Mechinda et al.).

Although place attachment to a setting can be either positive, negative, or both (Stedman, 2002), the positive aspects of place attachment have been emphasized more frequently than the negative aspects in the place attachment literature (Trentelman, 2009). Even though many researchers use the terms “sense of place” and “place attachment” interchangeably, for this study “place bonding” is used as the overarching concept that reflects positive, negative, or mixed feelings about places in human-place interactions. Specifically, this study will use the term place bonding to refer to an individual’s attachment to a place or object.

Nostalgia

The special meaning that people attach to specific places can be a result of a connection they make to some past time. Holak and Havlena (1998) suggest that in a world of increasing change and instability, people often look to this past to escape the present or questionable future. Social and cultural norms are also experiencing change, leaving us anxious and lost amongst what was once familiar (Davis, 1979). The term nostalgia is often used to describe this yearning for an either real or imaginary past. Aden (1995) posits that nostalgia may indicate an individuals' desire to regain some control over their lives in an uncertain time.

Historically, the word nostalgia has been used as a medical term to explain the symptoms associated with homesickness. In more recent research, the term nostalgia has been defined in a more sociological manner. From this sociological perspective, nostalgia is defined as allowing human beings to maintain their identity in the face of major transitions, which serve as discontinuities in the life cycle (Havlena & Holak, 1991). Davis (1979) further posits that what causes people to feel nostalgia must also reside in the present, regardless of how much the ensuing nostalgic experience may draw its meaning from their memory of the past. Davis suggests nostalgia is one of the means employed in the continuous process of constructing, maintaining, and reconstructing identities. Wilson (1999) suggests that in order to maintain these identities, there is often a need to actively reconstruct the past. Although not essential, active reconstruction often involves travel to a destination that evokes certain memories. For sports fans, this travel may include travel to the 'shrine' associated with their favorite team or favorite sport.

In order to measure potential nostalgic feelings, Pascal, Sprott, and Muehling (2002), developed a ten-item evoked nostalgia scale (NOST). The conceptualization of nostalgia presented by Holbrook and Schindler (1991) was used to determine the items used in constructing this scale. Participants filled out a questionnaire containing these items after viewing a group of advertisements. The results suggested that evoked nostalgia was a significant predictor of a more positive attitude toward advertisements. The results also suggested that the more nostalgia was evoked by an advertisement, the greater the brand purchase likelihood.

In applying the nostalgia concept to sport tourism, Redmond (1991) recognized that, in addition to event spectators and active sport participants, visitors to famous sport attractions such as museums, halls of fame, and famous stadiums also constituted sport tourists. Taking a lead from Redmond's discussion regarding people who visit sport related attractions, Gibson (1998b) identified those sport tourists who were interested in visiting sports halls of fame or famous stadiums as nostalgia sport tourists. According to Gammon (2002), sport is a good indicator of change, and when combined with a nostalgically driven media, it can also be a strong reminder of the past and the way things used to be. It is the "visiting and, perhaps, paying homage" aspect of sport tourist behavior that Gibson (1998b) termed 'nostalgia sport tourism' (p. 49). Gibson suggested that an examination of theoretical approaches from anthropological and sociological understandings of pilgrimage could reveal some insight into this phenomenon. One idea that has emerged is that sport is a new religion and stadiums, as well as sport museums, have become sacred sites within our culture (Chidester, 1996; Gammon, 2002).

Ramshaw and Gammon (2005) claim that the term nostalgia is not adequate to encompass the phenomena of traveling to visit sports related venues. They posit that nostalgia fails to encompass the holistic aspect that the term heritage provides for. They situate nostalgia sport tourism within a heritage context and contend that heritage is a more fitting categorization, but the term heritage is difficult to define. Nostalgia, on the other hand, is more easily defined. What causes it and how it impacts tourists might be open to debate, but the term itself has a generally accepted definition, yet understanding its impacts for sport tourism is complicated. Aden (1995) examined the linkage between baseball and nostalgia by examining the text of several baseball documentaries to discover what particular uncertainties baseball nostalgia addresses. He concluded the main uncertainty addressed was an individual's concern about work.

Identity is influenced by participation in a community (Healy, 1991). It follows that identity can be affected by one's involvement in baseball and work communities. Healy posited that baseball and the memories associated with the game are influential forces in identity formation. Likewise, work provides individuals with a sense of who they are. Conrad (1988) implies that both of these communities develop and become stronger in response to work conditions, which dehumanizes the individual. He points to the development of unions in both communities as evidence of their shared mindset. Aden concludes that nostalgic communication provides individuals with a means of symbolically escaping cultural conditions that they find depressing and/or disorienting. Using communication to move through time allows individuals to situate themselves in a sanctuary of meaning, a place where they feel safe from oppressive cultural conditions.

Much like tourism, two journeys are often made in nostalgically driven sport tourism, including the journey made to the attraction or event and the imagined journey that takes place once there. Fairley (2003) offers the interpretation that it may be the social experience that nostalgia sport tourists are seeking to relive what motivates them to travel. She suggests the temptation to consider nostalgia tourism as cultural heritage is based on thinking of nostalgia as only relating to physical entities. This ignores the consideration that sport consumption is a fundamentally social experience. Fairley further posits that the source of nostalgia may well be the memories derived from sports based social experiences, especially those that involve groups traveling together.

Holak and Havlena (1998) suggested that individuals may yearn to relive a particular experience in order to obtain feelings which were associated with it. It is important to note that they do not believe any events taking place before one's birth can be relevant in a nostalgia sense. Holbrook and Schindler (1991) disagree, arguing that if an event or object is embedded in a culture, then it can be a focus for nostalgia. He allows for the development of nostalgia based on learning that has taken place through socialization or the media. Regardless of their source, Healey (1991) found memories of sport signify important events in people's lives. In addition, they often include the group relationships with which they are associated. Again, the importance of the social aspect can be seen. Aden (1995) continues this train of thought by suggesting liminal and liminoid states that individuals have experienced may be stored as memories and used as sources of comfort during times of disenchantment. He suggests that the main causes of this disenchantment would be overly structured and mundane lives.

Snyder (1991) posits that the visitation of nostalgic venues, such as halls of fame and museums, can be viewed as a form of socialization in which artifacts and the memories people attach to them symbolically convey the values and norms of a society. Segrave (2001) adds that these so-called ”cathedrals of sport” allow us to connect with a more social sense of who we are both as individuals and as members of a society, noting that sports do not just take place anywhere and that these sites become culturally significant places that are celebrated as repositories of history, folklore, and sentiment. When the object of nostalgia appears to be a historic site, one cannot make the assumption that nostalgia is the primary reason for travel to the site. Wilson (2004) surveyed tourists visiting Wrigley Field in Chicago to determine if people taking the ballpark tour were motivated by nostalgia. Her results revealed that nostalgia was not the main factor in the decision of participants to take a tour of Wrigley Field. Novelty, enhancement of kinship relationships, prestige, facilitation of social interaction, and relaxation were all more important motives tourists had for taking the tour. A gender comparison of motivations revealed that men were more likely to report that the tour took them back to their childhood while women were more likely to feel that spending time with family/friends was more important than nostalgia. These findings offer support for the contention that what is being labeled nostalgia sport tourism may well be nostalgia for a past social experience that one wants to relive. Mason, Duquette, and Scherer (2005) examine the relationship between sport tourism and Canadian junior hockey and found a similar longing for past social experiences that had been shared.

Dann (1994) advocated that the quest to capture the past was seen as superior to experiencing the present by many tourists. Fenway Park and historic ball fields like it

offer sport fans the opportunity to travel back in time (Smith, 2003). Despite some changes, the main features of the park have remained the same throughout its history. Having been featured on television for a number of historic games, its features are famous even to sport fans that have never attended a game there, but in addition to being famous among baseball fans, it is a famous landmark in the city of Boston.

The debate now taking place about whether nostalgia sport tourism is in fact heritage tourism or a search for a social experience has helped the body of knowledge concerning nostalgia sport tourism to grow. The debate over nostalgia's role in sport tourism has promoted further thinking and discussion on the topic. The research that has been done since has greatly enhanced our understanding of nostalgia sport tourism. We now know that nostalgia may not be a primary motivation, but it can be a significant factor, depending upon the type of site being examined or type of trip being taken. The process of examining small travel groups was a valuable advancement in research in this area. Researchers seeking to understand sport tourism behaviors on a society wide scale will benefit from first understanding behaviors on individual and group levels.

Baseball, Place Bonding, and Fan Loyalty

Baseball is steeped in nostalgia and mythology about long ago games and times (Erickson, 2001; Ward & Burns, 1996). This collective mythology connects today's fans to past generations and places. What makes Fenway Park unique is that it not only reminds people of the past, but it is actually from that past. The values and beliefs represented by Fenway Park have come to symbolically constitute the aura that many associate with it. Over time, this aura has gained strength to the point that it no longer merely represents tradition, but has become part of the tradition itself. At the same time,

Fenway Park has become important to Boston and even surrounding states. Both Hardy (2003) and Reiss (1999) posit that to understand sport historiography after 1917, one must understand the relationship between the city and the sport.

Wann, Bayens, and Driver (2004) suggest that the likelihood of attending a sporting event increases as the perception of ticket scarcity increases. In Boston, available Red Sox tickets are scarce; however, the demand to attend games at Fenway Park cannot be based solely on the availability of tickets. As any Bostonian knows, there is a certain status that comes with having tickets to a big game at Fenway Park, but there is much more to the draw than that. Depkin (2000) posits that while fan loyalty is extremely difficult to measure, it is perhaps the most important factor influencing a team's financial situation. His research suggests that fan loyalty influences decisions that fans make regarding the team in every area of interaction, from attendance and merchandise purchases to support for public funding for stadiums.

Hunt, Bristol, and Bashaw (1999) suggest that using attendance figures to measure fan loyalty limits our understanding of a more complicated process. They further posit that relying on team performance as the primary determinant of fan behavior is too narrow of a focus. They suggest categorizing fans into five types: *temporary, local, devoted, fanatical,* and *dysfunctional*. One important addition to future research suggested by their study is the importance of dividing fans into more than a simple two-category model. Simply differentiating between serious and non-serious fans limits one's ability to understand the totality of fan behaviors. Depkin (2001) concludes that it is vital to understand fan loyalty if a franchise is to be successful. He

cites a lack of fan loyalty as the primary reason for the relocation of professional sports franchises, not strictly economic factors.

Wakefield (1995) posited that social influences were a major contributing factor influencing sporting event attendance. His research indicated that friends, family, and community all influenced one's identification with the team, as well as event attendance. Among his more interesting findings was the suggestion that if an individual perceives that their family and or friends approve of going to the game, everything else related to the game experience is perceived in a more favorable light. This finding suggests the importance of social factors not being underestimated when evaluating fans motivations and satisfaction related to attending a sporting event. He found significant support suggesting that social acceptance played a key role in spectator's attendance intentions. He also noted the importance of the popularity of the team owners and the players as contributing to a community's social acceptance of an organization. To understand the relationship between the RSN and the Boston Red Sox organization, one must take in to account these factors.

Even before the introduction of the term "nostalgia sport tourism" into the literature, the sites at which sporting action was played out were considered significant. Bale (1989) outlined that in terms of baseball, the playing field itself has been viewed as a vestige of the American frontier. While Ross (1973) further explained the symbolic comparison of the sports sites to an America of the past, separating the diamond as the urban core, infield as the supporting hinterland and outfield as the frontier. Additionally, he posited that the physical environment of a baseball stadium can bring back memories of a lost pastoral world and at the same time be related to the day-to-day

work of an individual with division of labor, specialization of roles, and limited independence.

There has been a growing interest among researchers to examine the relationship between sports facilities and place (Tangen, 2004). Tangen posits that not enough research has been conducted to attempt to explain how certain facilities elicit either a love of place or a sense of place. In addition, he notes that the definition of place has been very fluid in the research. Bale (1995) posits that there does appear to be a connection between the actual sport and its facility, which has been overlooked in the research. Tangen adds that except for economic based research, sports facilities have largely been neglected as a topic of research.

Carter (2002) advocates strongly for an anthropological approach to studying sport. He based this assertion on his claim that until very recently, sport has been perceived by researchers as either not a viable subject for study or unworthy of serious contemplation because it involved play rather than work. He contends that this view of sport as being somehow removed from the seriousness of everyday life and, therefore, not socially relevant, continues as most academics that study sport do so after beginning their academic careers studying another aspect of society. Since this claim by Carter, the academic focus on sport as an important topic of inquiry has increased, especially in the fields of sociology and history. Perhaps researchers have finally moved beyond Huizinga's (1971) contention that sports stood outside of ordinary life and were therefore "not serious" (p. 27). However, the fact remains that more research is needed to help explain the relationship between sports facilities and the sense of place that they create. Sports facilities may help satisfy intrinsic needs, such as the push factors

suggested by Dann (1977) and Crompton (1979). The sense of place provided by a sports facility may help satisfy visitor's sociological factors, such as sense of belonging and the search for nostalgic comfort.

According to Zillman, Bryant, and Sapolsky (1989), in addition to sharing these varying levels of curiosity, sport fanship can unite and create feelings of belonging, which are beneficial to individuals, as well as the social setting in which they live. The Red Sox Nation as an example of sport fanship provides an excellent medium in which to investigate the interaction between fanship and both the physical and social settings where the interactions occur. Social identity theory is based on Festinger's (1954) social comparison theory, which suggests that individuals will strive to attach themselves to other individuals who are similar or slightly better. Social identity theory focuses on the ways in which individuals perceive and categorize themselves, emphasizing group processes and inter-group relations. A better understanding of the perceptions of sport fans may help researchers gain a better understanding of why sport fans do what they do.

If concepts such as place attachment, nostalgia, and fan identification are to be researched in conjunction with loyalty to a sports facility, Boston provides the ideal setting to do so. The RSN provides a highly identified fan base to examine, the Boston area hosts a milieu where even non-fans are at least aware of the team's importance to the area, and Fenway Park provides an ideal setting to explore sense of place as it relates to a sports facility. If any major league ballpark is capable of generating a sense of place based on a long and storied history, the only two that are likely to be able to do so would be Chicago's Wrigley Field and Boston's Fenway Park. Fenway Park also

provides an opportunity to examine how nostalgia, place attachment, and fan identity fit into a potential business decision. Boston provides a rare opportunity to examine multiple variables of interest in one iconic setting.

CHAPTER 3
METHODS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the level of fan identification, place bonding, nostalgia for Fenway Park, and attitudes towards the future of Fenway Park. Individuals, mostly from the Boston region, accessing two Boston newspaper websites were the unit of analysis for this research. An on-line survey was used to measure the variables of interest. This chapter presents the instrumentation, data collection procedures, participant description, and details on the data analyses used.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire (Appendix B) consisted of four parts. The first part asked respondents about their degree of fanship. This section determined the strength of the relationship the respondent felt towards the Red Sox, or level of fan identification. It contained the six-item Team Identification Scale developed by Wann (1997). This scale was used to categorize respondents into groupings based on their level of fanship. This scale is atypical in that it uses an eight point scale, from 1= not very important to 8= very important, rather than the more common five point Likert type scale but it was found to be both reliable and valid by Wann and has been used frequently by other researchers (Wann, 2006). Summated scores on the scale range between a possible low of 6 and a possible high of 48. The internal consistency for the scale was tested using Cronbach's alpha, and elicited a (α=.94). The reliability of the original scale as tested by Wann (1997) had a Cronbach's alpha (α=.93). Responses to the six questions were indexed and a mean score for team identification was calculated. To measure degree of 'fanship' with a single metric, individual questionnaire items

measuring degree of fan identification were summed together. Items measured by the scale included how closely respondents follow the Red Sox in the media and how strongly respondents dislike the Yankees.

The second part of the questionnaire sought to understand respondent's experiences and beliefs about Fenway Park. This section measured respondents' place bonding towards Fenway Park. Place bonding was measured using a five dimensional scale developed by Hammitt, Kyle and Oh (2009). Place bonding items were assessed through a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Hammit, et al., established the overall scale reliability for measuring place bonding, with a Cronbach's alpha (α=.84), data collected in this study indicated a slightly higher level of reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of α=.94. The scale includes questions such as "I know Fenway Park's layout very well" and "I feel like I belong at Fenway Park" to measure respondents' place bonding. The scale includes five separate dimensions and five composite scores representing the place bonding dimensions were computed for analysis: Place Familiarity, Place Belongingness, Place Identity, Place Dependence, and Place Rootedness. The construction of the five dimension score replicated definitions empirically identified by Hammit el al. Cronbach's alpha scores for each dimension are as follows: Place Familiarity α= .92, Place Belongingness α= .92, Place Identity α= .95, Place Dependence α= .93, and Place Rootedness α= .76. Hammit et al. (2006) found the following Cronbach alpha scores for the five dimensions: Place Familiarity α= .82, Place Belongingness α= .95, Place Identity α= .94, Place Dependence α= .92, and Place Rootedness α= .89.

The second part of the questionnaire also included a measure of respondent's attitudes towards the future of Fenway Park. Respondents were asked to select one option from a list of potential scenarios compiled from possible futures suggested for Fenway Park in the media. The items included options such as "Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations" and "Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design." In addition, the second section of the questionnaire asked respondents to complete the ten-item Evoked Nostalgia Scale (NOST) developed by Pascal, et al. (2002). The scale was tested for internal consistency and a Cronbach's alpha of α= .97 was found and is similar to original scale reliability as established by Pascal, et al. (α=.98). This scale was used to examine the extent to which the respondents felt nostalgia towards Fenway Park. This scale measures feelings of nostalgia towards an object or event by asking respondents to rank their nostalgic feelings on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree for questions such as "It evokes fond memories" and "It reminds me of good times in the past."

The third section of the instrument assessed the respondent's interactions with the Red Sox team and Fenway Park. Respondents were asked if they are Red Sox fans, as well as questions concerning their Fenway Park attendance patterns using items such as "How often they attended games at Fenway Park" and "How many years they had been a Red Sox fan"? The fourth part consisted of demographic questions such as age, gender, annual household income, and education.

Data Collection

A web-based survey was the data collection technique employed (Henderson & Bialeschki, 2010). Contact with the Boston Red Sox organization began in June 2009 to

secure their cooperation. Both the *Boston Globe* and the *Boston Herald* agreed to post a link to the survey instrument on their respective web sites. The most recent data available concerning the online readership of these papers shows that the Globe's free Boston.com site attracted 2.8 million unique visitors in April 2012, compared to 1.2 million for BostonHerald.com ("Media Nation," 2012). Once the project's graduate advisory committee reviewed and approved the survey, a pilot study was conducted to ensure that the questionnaire was easy to comprehend and follow. Pilot study participants reported no significant issues with understanding the questions. Content and face validity was established by ten individuals that hold graduate degrees in the social sciences familiar with survey research. Each individual read the survey and the only problem that arose was that two individuals found the print was too small for one of the scales. That problem was addressed in the online version and formatted in a larger font. No other issues were reported by any of the ten individuals.

After the questionnaire was reviewed and approved by UF IRB, a survey link was forwarded to both the *Boston Globe* and *Boston Herald* newspapers as per prior arrangement. Initially, the Red Sox management had agreed to post the survey on the team website, however, a copy was not forwarded to the Red Sox management organization, as the project academic advisors and the principal investigator decided that it would be better to not post on a site that was more likely to capture mostly very strongly identified fans and that the newspaper sites would be more likely to capture a more varied sample. Adjacent to the link on each web site, a brief explanation of the study and a request for participation was posted. This link emphasized that participation was voluntary. By posting on the front pages of Boston's most read newspapers sites,

The Boston Herald and *The Boston Globe*, data were collected from readers of both papers to capture participation from Red Sox fans, as well as non-Red Sox fans. The instructions posted with the link invited non-fans to participate in the survey.

Dillman (2007) details both the strengths and weaknesses of using online surveys to gather data. The use of an online survey reduces the time required for survey implementation, as well as controlling the cost of data collection associated with other approaches. In addition to reducing both costs and time needed to gather data, an online survey provides for real time coding of answers to closed ended and quantitative items. Online surveys also provide for a more dynamic presentation appearance than paper surveys, both in terms of formatting and interaction. Dillman also warns researchers not to overlook potential problem areas when surveying online. He warns researchers to keep in mind that one cannot assume respondents have previous experience with online surveys. On one level, this appeared to not be an issue in this case as all respondents filled out the questionnaire completely. It appears that if a respondent was computer literate enough to find it and open the survey, they had no problem with completing it. If an online survey is too complicated for respondents, one runs the risk of increased survey error. This concern did not appear to have posed a problem due to the survey format and the nature of the question structure and wording. Dillman (2007) also emphasizes that a large number of respondents online does not necessarily mean it is a representative sample of a larger population. This potential weakness is acknowledged as a delimitation of this study.

Due to the logistics of attempting to reach a geographically dispersed sample of Boston area residents, a non-random sampling procedure was used to recruit

participants. The nature of the data collection using an online survey through two newspapers necessitated the need for purposive sampling. Data were collected by posting the survey link on front pages of both the *Boston Globe* and *Boston Herald* newspaper websites for a period of four days. The survey was posted from Friday to Monday, December 16 to December 19, 2011, to capture participants from both weekdays and weekend days. The survey link was posted on both websites simultaneously. The posted link connected participants to a Survey Monkey® website where an online informed consent form and questionnaire were located. After being posted for a four day period, 409 questionnaires were completed. Since this was above the targeted number of respondents and the results appeared to contain significant variance on several key variables, the survey was not posted for a longer duration or on any other websites, as a sample size of 385 or larger was the minimum goal and both newspapers would only agree to a four day posting.

Sample Description

The sample was comprised of n= 409, individuals (Table 3-1). More than half of the respondents (64.1%, n=262) were male and (35.9%, n= 147) were female. The largest segment of participants were aged between 41-45 years old (23.7%, n=97). When the respondents were asked to describe their highest level of education, 0.2% (n=1) reported they had less than a high school degree, 15.6% (n=64) reported having a high school degree, 43.5% (n=178) reported they had a bachelor's degree, and 27.6% (n=113), reported they had a master's degree. In terms of annual household income, the modal category was an annual household income between $50,001 and $75,000 (20.5%, n=84). When asked about their racial or ethnic background, the vast majority of respondents (95.6%, n=391) were Caucasian, 2.9% (n=12) identified themselves as

other, 1.2% (n=5) identified themselves as Hispanic, 0.2% (n=1) identified themselves as Asian, and no respondents reported being African American or Native American. When asked how far in minutes they traveled to get to Fenway Park, the largest segment of respondents (23.2%, n=95) indicated that they traveled between 41 and 60 minutes to get to Fenway Park, 19.1% (n=78) reported traveling between 21 and 40 minutes. When asked which newspaper they read most often, the largest segment of respondents 44.3% (n=181) reported reading *The Boston Globe* most often, while 11.7% (n=48) reported reading both *The Boston Globe* and *The Boston Herald* daily.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS Statistical Software, version 16.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL). For the first research question, identifying the attitudes of RSN fans toward the future of Fenway Park, frequencies were generated.

For research question 2a **"**what are the levels of fan identification among Greater Boston residents?" frequencies were generated for all six indicators of fan identification. To measure degree of "fanship" with a single metric, individual questionnaire items measuring degree of fan identification were summed together to create an index. The six items were measured with the same response scale (1 to 8) and higher scores represented increasing levels of fan identification; as such, summing the individual items into an index is conceptually appropriate.

For research question 2b "are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents towards future modifications of Fenway Park and level of fan identification", a univariate ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between level of fan identification and attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park. Analysis of

variance (ANOVA) is a statistical technique to assess significant differences between mean scores among groups (Tabachnick, 2001).

In the current study, the groups created for analysis purposes are related to respondent's attitude about future modifications of Fenway Park. This is a single independent variable with six levels (attitude toward future modifications of Fenway Park) and is appropriate for employing one-way ANOVA. The mean scores under investigation (level of fan identification) were assessed in relation to attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park. The goal of the analysis was to determine across groups if any significant differences were detectable on the dependent variables fan identification, nostalgia, and place bonding. Given that levels of attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park groupings were unequal (there were highly variable numbers of respondents per group); the ANOVA technique employed was the type III sum of squares, which is the technique suitable for analysis when the sample sizes across attitude levels are unbalanced (i.e., do not have the same number of people in each attitude category), using the SPSS statistical software program.

Contingent on the data meeting the required assumptions for analysis, the ANOVA procedure required production of omnibus and multiple comparisons results (Norusis, 2003). The former is a general test to determine if any group differences exist and the latter a test to determine where group differences exist. Once it was determined that group differences did exist post-hoc analysis was conducted. The post-hoc analysis capitalizes on chance error and therefore, the test is carried out with a Bonferroni correction to control for type I error.

For research question 3a “what is the level of nostalgia among Greater Boston residents with regards to Fenway Park?”; similar to degree of fan identification, frequencies were generated measuring the dimension “nostalgia” as a composite score requiring summing individual nostalgia items into one aggregate score. Items were measured using a five point Likert scale with the increasing values along the scale representing greater levels of nostalgia; as such, summing items into an index was conceptually appropriate. There was one respondent whose responses to the NOST scale were missing 90% of item level data and therefore, this individual’s responses were excluded from the composite score computation, for this scale only.

For research question 3b “are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents toward future modifications of Fenway Park and level of nostalgia?” a univariate analysis ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between level of nostalgia and attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park. Analysis was conducted in the same manner as the ANOVA detailed for research question 2b with the grouping variable (attitude toward future modifications of Fenway Park) tested in relation to level of nostalgia.

Regarding research question 4a “what is the level of place bonding to Fenway Park among Greater Boston residents?” the items for each of the five dimensions were measured to answer this question. The researcher relied upon the previously defined items for each dimension as determined by Hammitt, et al. (2009). According to Floyd (1995), this is a standard and acceptable statistical procedure for developing a score for use in further analyses. As previously noted, each questionnaire item was measured on the same scale (Likert scale values of 1= strongly agree to 5= strongly disagree), as

such, no additional adjustments were required prior to summing the item scores. In cases where data points were missing, no missing imputation procedure was used and the dimensions were computed to represent the sum of available items.

For research question 4b “are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents toward future modifications of Fenway Park and the five dimensions of place bonding?” a multivariate analysis, MANOVA was employed. Similar to ANOVA, multivariate analysis of variance MANOVA is a statistical procedure used to assess differences in mean scores across groups. However, in MANOVA, the goal is to determine if statistical differences occur across multiple dependent variables where the dependent variables are assessed simultaneously. The value of MANOVA over the use of separate ANOVA tests is a method which inherently controls for Type I error and accounts for the highly probable correlation between each dependent variable’s mean score. The post-hoc analysis capitalizes on chance error and therefore the test is carried out with a Bonferroni correction to control for type I error (Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2006).

Table 3-1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participants (N=409)

Demographic	N	%
Gender		
Male	262	64.10
Female	147	35.91
Race and Ethnicity		
White	391	95.59
Hispanic/Latino	5	1.22
Native American	0	0.0
Asian	1	0.24
Black	0	0.0
Other	12	2.93
Education		
Less than high school	1	0.24
High school graduate	64	15.64
Associate or technical degree	32	7.82
Bachelor's degree	178	43.52
Master's degree	113	27.62
Doctoral degree	21	5.13
Annual Household Income		
$25,000 or less	55	13.44
$25,001 - $50,000	38	9.29
$50,001 - $75,000	84	20.53
$75,001 - $100,000	80	19.55
$100,001 - $125,000	45	11.00
$125,001 - $150,000	34	8.31
$150,001 or more	73	17.84
Age		
18-25	74	18.09
26-30	32	7.82
31-35	33	8.06
36-40	36	8.80
41-45	97	23.71
46-55	80	19.55
56-65	47	11.49
66-75	8	1.95
75 or older	2	0.48

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The research questions were answered by assessing levels of fan identification, place bonding, nostalgia among the participants, and testing the relationship between these three variables and attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park.

Level of Fan Identification

Attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park

Research question 1: What are the attitudes of Greater Boston residents toward future modifications of Fenway Park?

Respondents were asked to indicate what they thought the future plans for Fenway Park should be by choosing between six options. Most respondents (55.8%) believe Fenway Park should remain as is and the best decision would be to upgrade and/or renovate the existing structure. Among the other options, responses are dispersed: demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design (11.7%), the current structure should be expanded (11.0%), no change be made (8.8%), leave Fenway as a museum and build a new stadium (9.1%), or a completely new stadium be constructed (3.7%). (Table 4-1).

Research question 2a: What are the levels of fan identification among Greater Boston residents?

Across the six individual items of the fan identification scale, means ranged from M= 5.8 in response to how much of a Red Sox fan are you to M= 3.8 for frequency of displaying the Red Sox insignia (on a 1-8 importance scale) (Table 4-2). The lowest summed score reported was a 6, while the highest summed score reported was 48 (M=31.3, SD=2.29).

Research question 2b: Are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents towards future modifications of Fenway Park and level of fan identification?

The mean scores across fan identification items by attitudes towards potential Fenway Park modifications are reported (Table 4-3). As was previously indicated, a large percent of sample feel the “park’s structure should be retained with minor upgrades or renovations” (55.75%). This group has one of the higher scores for fan identity seen across groups (M=5.5, SD=2.0). The group that desires to the see the “construction be expanded” has the highest fan identification score (M=6.0, SD=2.1). Finally, the group indicating the “park should be a museum and a new stadium built” also have relatively high fan identity scores (M=5.5, SD=2.3). As would be expected, those respondents with less favorable attitudes toward “keeping the current park” demonstrate lower fan identification scores. The omnibus results from the ANOVA model as indicated by the F ratio results $F(5,408) = 8.90$, $p<.01$ show a significant difference among the different attitude groups in relation to fan identification levels and the significance level is sufficiently robust to assess where the differences are occurring (Table 4-4).

Post-hoc analysis was implemented. The full results from the post-hoc analysis where a Bonferroni correction is applied to results to correct for multiple comparisons is reported in Table 4-5. There are a total of five unique instances identified by the post-hoc analysis where group differences are sufficiently robust to be considered to be reliably different (that is, all p values are at or below 0.01). The group believing “no changes should be made to Fenway Park” has statistically lower levels of fan identification than the group suggesting “minor upgrades” and the group suggesting the “current structure should be expanded”. The group who believe the park “should be demolished and a new one built” has a fan identification mean score that is significantly

lower than three other groups, including those believing the “current structure should be retained with minor upgrades”, the “current structure should be expanded”, or “Fenway should be a museum and another stadium built”.

Nostalgia Levels

Research question 3a: What is the level of nostalgia among Greater Boston residents with regards to Fenway Park?

The item level descriptive statistics revealed that respondents’ nostalgic feelings are highest for “reminds me of the past” (M=3.9, SD=1.0) and “evokes fond memories” (M=3.8, SD=1.1), while they were lowest for “it reminds me of the good old days” (M= 3.5, SD= 1.1), (Table 4-6). The summed scores for the NOST scale ranged from 20 to 42 with a mean of (M=36.7, SD=1.9).

Research question 3b: Are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents towards future modifications of Fenway Park and level of nostalgia?

The mean scores for overall nostalgia by attitudes towards potential Fenway Park modifications are reported Table 4-7. Those with attitudes relating to “performing minor or some level of expansion of the current stadium” or “converting the stadium to a museum prior to replacement” show the highest levels of nostalgia scores. An indifference to the current stadium “preferring a new ballpark” have the lowest nostalgia score (M=2.4, SD=1.3).

Table 4-8 displays the omnibus results for the ANOVA. The F ratio F (5,407) =17.30, p=0.01 indicates a significant difference has been detected among the Fenway attitude groups on nostalgia level and the level of significance is robust enough to perform an post-hoc analysis.

The post-hoc analysis revealed a total of seven unique group-wise differences of average level of nostalgia among respondents with varying levels of Fenway Park

attitudes (Table 4-9). Each difference was significant at the p<.01 alpha level and will be explored here. First, respondents who indicated “no changes should be made to Fenway Park” (M=3.0, SD=1.4) had statistically significant lower levels of aggregate nostalgia scores than respondents with the following attitudes: “current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations” (M=3.9, SD=0.8) and “the current structure should be expanded” (M=4.0, SD=0.7). Next, groups of respondents that were open for demolishing the stadium, “demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design” (M=3.3, SD=0.9) and “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” (M=2.4, SD=1.3) had statistically lower levels of nostalgia than respondents feeling the “current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations” (M=3.9, SD=0.8). Similarly, the group suggesting “the current structure should be expanded” (M=4.0, SD=0.7) also had higher levels of nostalgia than the two groups open to demolishing the park. Finally, the group who felt it is best to leave “Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium” (M=3.5, SD=1.0) had higher levels of nostalgia than one group open to demolishing the park, “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” (M=2.4, SD=1.3). In sum, essentially respondents whose attitude was that Fenway should be expanded, upgraded, or held as a historical treasure report higher levels of nostalgia for the park than groups who are open to demolishing the park.

Level of Attachment to Fenway Park

Research question 4a: What is the level of place bonding to Fenway Park among Greater Boston residents?

Across the five dimensions, Place Familiarity and Place Belongingness have the highest average scores (M=3.5, SD=1.2 and M=3.5, SD=1.2, respectively) and,

therefore, suggest these dimensions represent the strongest attachment characteristics for the respondents (Table 4-10). Place Identify and Dependence had similar mean scores (M=3.3, SD=1.2 and M=3.2, SD=1.3, respectively) and were just slightly lower than for Place Familiarity and Place Belongingness, suggesting respondents' attachments to Fenway are still fairly moderate (considering scores can range between 1 to 5). Place Rootedness yielded the smallest mean (M=2.8, SD=1.0). The summed scores for Place Familiarity ranged from 6 to 14 (M=10.4, SD 3.7). The summed scores for Place Belonging ranged from 4 to 9 (M=6.9, SD 2.4). The summed scores for Place Identity ranged from 5 to 13 (M=9.7, SD 3.7). Summed scores for Place Dependence ranged from 5 to 14 (M=9.5, SD 3.9) and summed scores for Place Rootedness ranged from 7 to 18 (M=6.9, SD 4.0).

Research question 4b: Are there differences in the attitudes of Greater Boston residents toward future modifications of Fenway Park and the five dimensions of place bonding?

MANOVA was used to investigate the relationship between the five dimensions of place bonding and differences among the attitudes of Greater Boston residents towards future modifications of Fenway Park. The Box test results suggest the data do not meet the assumption of equality of covariance matrices ($\chi^2 = 138.53$, $df = 75$, $p < .001$). Given this, the log determinants are reviewed to observe if values are similar across groups. Log determinant values at the group level were generally similar, the attitude group with the least number of respondents ("demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark ") was sufficiently different from the remaining levels. There is no immediate remedy for violating this statistical assumption and, as such, the results will be less robust than if this assumption were met.

Omnibus results for the MANOVA indicate there is evidence that there are differences among these groups, The F ratio F (25, 1476) =9.82, p<.001 indicates a significant difference has been detected among the Fenway attitude groups on place bonding levels and the level of significance is robust enough to perform the post-hoc analysis, (Table 4-11). Analysis of the relationship between place bonding scores and attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park suggests that a general conclusion can be drawn that, from a multivariate perspective, place bonding dimensions do differ across Fenway attitude groups (Table 4-12).

In Table 4-13, the post hoc results assessing Place Familiarity across each attitude toward Fenway group are presented. Overall, "no changes should be made to Fenway Park," which demonstrates the lowest mean score for Place Familiarity (*M*=2.53, *SD*=1.28) is statistically different from "current structure should be retained," "current structure should be expanded," "demolish existing structure and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design," and "leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium."

Post hoc results are reported for the Place Belongingness dimension per attitude group (Table 4-14). Here many group level differences are observed in mean scores for Place Belongingness. The "no change" attitude group has statistically lower mean scores for place belongingness (*M*=2.71, *SD*=1.43) than that reported by the "current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations" group (*M*=3.73, *SD*=1.06) and "the current structure should be expanded" group (*M*=3.93, *SD*=1.02). The latter two groups also have statistically higher mean scores on Place Belongingness than the "demolish the stadium" attitude groups. Finally, the group

“leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium” (*M*=3.27, *SD*=1.19) has a statistically higher mean score on Place Belongingness than the “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” group (*M*=1.83, *SD*=1.08).

Post hoc results are reported for the Place Identity dimension per attitude group (Table 4-15). Here, we note that the two groups wanting to retain the current structure (“current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations” and “the current structure should be expanded”) have statistically higher mean scores for Place Identity than all other attitude groups. We also observe the “no change” group (M=2.53, SD=1.28) had statistically different mean scores from the “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” group (M=1.59, SD=0.90) where the former group’s score was statistically higher.

Post hoc results are reported for the Place Dependence dimension in Table 4-16. The “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” group has a mean score for place dependence (M=1.36, SD=0.67) that is statistically lower than all other groups with the exception of the “demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway’s design” group. The two groups wanting to “retain the current structure” again have similar mean scores for Place Dependence and are statistically different from the “demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design” (M=1.98, SD=0.96) and “leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium” groups (M=2.59, SD=1.30).

Post hoc results are reported for the Place Rootedness dimension in Table 4-17.

As has been observed in other place bonding dimensions, the “retain the stadium” groups have statistically higher mean scores for Place Rootedness than both the

“demolish” groups. There are also statistically significant differences on Place Rootedness between the “no change” group (*M*=2.43, *SD*=1.17) and the “current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations” (*M*=3.05, *SD*=0.92) and “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” groups (*M*=1.30, *SD* = 0.50).

Summary

Most respondents believe Fenway Park should remain with upgrades and/or renovations, with “a completely new stadium should be constructed” being the option with the least support. In terms of level of fan identification among Greater Boston residents, summed scores ranged from 6 to 48 with a mean of M= 31.3. In terms of the relationship between level of fan identification and attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park, as would be expected, those respondents with less favorable attitudes toward the park demonstrated lower fan identification scores.

Descriptive statistics revealed that the respondents’ nostalgic feelings were highest for “reminds me of the past” and lowest for “it reminds me of the good old days.” Respondents with attitudes relating to performing some level of expansion of the current stadium or converting the stadium to a museum prior to replacement show the highest levels of nostalgia scores, while those with an indifferent attitude towards future modifications of Fenway Park (those preferring a new ballpark) had the lowest nostalgia scores.

Across the five dimensions, Place Bonding, Place Familiarity, and Place Belongingness had the highest average scores, suggesting that these dimensions represent the strongest attachment characteristics for the respondents. Place Rootedness had the lowest average score. A general conclusion can be drawn that the

Place Bonding dimensions do differ across Fenway attitude groups. It can be noted that the two groups wanting to retain the current stadium structure had statistically higher mean scores for place identity than all other attitude groups, while groups wishing to replace the current stadium structure had lower average scores across the Place Bonding dimensions. Specific relationships between the variables are illustrated in Table 4-18.

Table 4-1. Attitudes towards Future Modifications of Fenway Park

Item	N	%
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	228	55.75
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	48	11.74
The current structure should be expanded	45	11.00
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	37	9.05
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	36	8.80
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	15	3.67
Total	409	100

Table 4-2. Descriptive statistics for fan identification

Dimension / item	*M*	*SD*	% 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Fan Identity Overall	31.3	2.29								
1 – How important is it to you that the Red Sox win	5.60	2.57	16.13	3.17	4.88	4.15	8.31	13.20	15.40	34.71
2 – How much of a Red Sox fan are you	5.80	2.55	12.46	3.66	7.82	4.64	8.31	8.31	11.24	43.58
3 – During the season, how closely do you follow the Red Sox	5.54	2.61	13.20	7.57	5.37	5.86	10.51	8.80	8.06	40.58
4 – How important is being a Red Sox fan to you	5.18	2.73	20.78	4.88	5.37	3.66	10.51	11.00	11.73	32.02
5 – How much do you dislike the Yankees	5.42	2.80	18.58	5.13	7.57	4.64	5.62	7.57	8.55	42.29
6 – How often do you display the Red Sox name or insignia	3.82	2.67	33.25	9.77	8.06	10.26	9.04	6.60	4.64	18.33

Note. Item scale values as follows: Item 1 & Item 4, 1=Not Important, 8=Very Important; Item 2, 1=Not at All a Fan, 8=Very Much a Fan; Item 3, 1=Never, 8=Almost Every Day; Item 5, 1=Do Not Dislike, 8=Dislike Very Much; Item 6, 1=Never, 8=Always.

Table 4-3. Attitudes toward Future Modifications of Fenway Park by level of Fan Identification

Item	N	M	SD
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	36	4.02	2.77
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	228	5.51	2.00
The current structure should be expanded	45	6.02	2.10
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	48	4.63	2.43
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	15	2.71	2.27
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	37	5.47	2.34

Items measured on an 8 point Likert type scale, 1=Strongly Disagree, 8= Strongly Agree

Table 4-4. ANOVA of Attitudes towards Fenway Park -Fan ID

	SS	*df*	MS	*F*	P
Between Groups	212.7	5	42.6	8.9	0.00
Within Groups	1927.5	403	4.8		
Total	2140.2	408			

Table 4-5. Post hoc analysis of fan identification by attitudes toward Fenway modifications

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	P
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.48	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-2.00	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.61	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.32	0.76
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-1.45	0.07
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.48	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.52	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.87	0.19
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	2.80	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.03	1.00
The current structure should be expanded	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	2.00	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	0.52	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	1.39	0.04
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	3.32	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.55	1.00

Table 4-5. Continued

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	P
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.61	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.87	0.19
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.39	0.04
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.93	0.05
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.84	1.00
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-1.32	0.76
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-2.80	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-3.32	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-1.93	0.05
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-2.77	0.00*
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.45	0.07
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.03	1.00
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.55	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.84	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	2.77	0.00*

* Indicates significant at p<.01

Table 4-6. Descriptive statistics for the nostalgia scale (NOST)

Item	*N*	*M*	*SD*	% 1	2	3	4	5[1]
Nostalgia Scale Overall	408	36.7	1.97					
It reminds me of the past	407	3.90	.96	4.64	3.17	14.18	52.81	24.69
It helps me recall pleasant memories	408	3.71	1.08	5.62	7.09	21.04	41.80	23.96
It makes me feel nostalgic	407	3.68	1.11	6.35	8.06	20.04	41.32	23.71
It makes me reminisce about a previous time	408	3.62	1.10	5.86	9.77	22.00	40.83	21.27
It makes me think about when I was younger	407	3.50	1.17	7.57	12.95	20.53	38.38	20.04
It evokes fond memories	405	3.75	1.08	6.35	5.86	18.33	44.00	24.44
It is a pleasant reminder of the past	403	3.74	1.06	5.86	5.62	18.82	45.47	22.73
It brings back memories of good times from the past	403	3.70	1.08	6.11	6.35	20.29	43.27	22.49
It reminds me of the good old days	407	3.49	1.09	6.60	9.53	29.58	35.69	18.09
It reminds me of good times in the past	407	3.62	1.06	6.11	6.60	25.91	41.07	19.80

Note[1]. Scale values as follows, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Table 4-7. Attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park by nostalgia level

Attitude	N	M	SD
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	36	2.98	1.45
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	228	3.92	0.75
The current structure should be expanded	45	3.98	0.73
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	48	3.26	0.87
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	15	2.41	1.27
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	36	3.54	.99

Scale 1=Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree (For the NOST Scale)

Table 4-8. ANOVA Omnibus results (attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway - nostalgia)

	SS	*df*	MS	*F*	p
Between groups	68.5	5	13.7	17.3	0.00
Within groups	317.9	402	0.8		
Total	386.4	407			

Table 4-9. Post hoc attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park by nostalgia level

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	P
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.94	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.01	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.28	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.57	0.57
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.57	0.11
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.94	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.07	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.66	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.51	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.38	0.29
The current structure should be expanded	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.01	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	0.07	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.73	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.58	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.44	0.41

Table 4-9. Continued

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	P
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.28	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.66	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.73	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.85	0.02
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.29	1.00
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-0.57	0.57
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.51	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.58	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.85	0.02
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-1.14	0.00*
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.57	0.11
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.38	0.29
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.44	0.41
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.29	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.14	0.00*

* Indicates significant at p<.01

Table 4-10. Descriptive statistics for place bonding by dimensions

Dimensions	*N*	*M*	*SD*	% 1	2	3	4	5[1]
Place Familiarity	409	3.48	1.23					
I could sketch a rough layout of Fenway Park	408	3.62	1.33	12.71	9.29	10.26	37.89	29.58
I have visited Fenway Park many times and I am quite familiar with it	407	3.50	1.30	10.75	12.95	17.11	32.27	26.40
I know Fenway Park's layout very well	409	3.33	1.32	11.73	17.60	19.80	27.1	23.71
Place Belongingness	408	3.46	1.25					
When at Fenway Park, I feel a part of it	406	3.60	1.25	10.75	7.82	17.35	36.91	26.40
I feel like I belong at Fenway Park	407	3.32	1.27	12.22	13.20	23.71	30.80	19.55
Place Identity	409	3.27	1.24					
Fenway Park means a great deal to me	408	3.37	1.29	12.46	11.98	23.71	29.33	22.24
I am very attached to Fenway Park	407	3.29	1.30	12.71	15.15	22.98	27.38	21.27
I identify strongly with Fenway Park	405	3.14	1.29	15.40	13.44	28.60	24.44	17.11
Place Dependence	408	3.20	1.30					
I get more satisfaction out of visiting Fenway Park than from visiting any other baseball stadium	406	3.26	1.36	15.40	12.46	25.18	22.49	23.71
No other baseball stadium compares to Fenway Park for attending a game	404	3.16	1.39	17.11	15.64	22.24	21.76	22.00
I wouldn't substitute any other stadium for Fenway for attending a baseball game	406	3.16	1.41	18.33	13.93	22.49	21.51	22.98

Table 4-10. Continued

Dimensions	*N*	*M*	*SD*	% 1	2	3	4	5[1]
Place Rootedness	408	2.78	0.99					
I would consider visiting any stadium as long as the Red Sox were playing	406	3.25	1.40	17.84	12.22	18.33	28.36	22.49
I rarely attend a home game at any other major league baseball stadium other than Fenway Park	407	3.14	1.35	16.62	15.15	24.69	23.22	19.80
When I am planning to attend a MLB game, I consider only Fenway Park	408	2.47	1.29	29.82	24.93	22.00	13.93	9.04
Fenway Park is the only stadium I want to attend a baseball game in	408	2.27	1.18	34.22	25.91	21.76	13.69	4.15

Note[1] . Scale values as follows, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Table 4-11. MANOVA results for place bonding and attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park

		Between Subjects Affects				
Variable	Multivariate *F*(25, 1476)	Place Familiarity *F*(5, 401)	Place Belongingness *F*(5, 401)	Place Identity *F*(5, 401)	Place Dependence *F*(5, 401)	Place Rootedness *F*(5, 401)
Attitude toward Fenway	9.82**	5.31**	15.03**	23.58**	31.24**	16.62**

**p<.001

Table 4-12. Place bonding scores by attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park

Attitudes toward Fenway	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Place Familiarity			
No changes should be made to Fenway	36	2.53	1.28
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	228	3.56	1.18
The current structure should be expanded	45	3.86	.96
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	48	3.46	1.33
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	15	3.38	1.45
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	37	3.64	1.23
Place Belongingness			
No changes should be made to Fenway	35	2.71	1.43
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	228	3.73	1.06
The current structure should be expanded	45	3.93	1.02
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	48	3.03	1.25
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	15	1.83	1.08
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	37	3.27	1.19
Place Identity			
No changes should be made to Fenway	36	2.65	1.36
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	228	3.66	1.05
The current structure should be expanded	45	3.67	1.11
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	48	2.42	1.12
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	15	1.58	.90
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	37	2.27	1.20
Place Dependence			
No changes should be made to Fenway	36	2.95	1.36
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	228	3.68	1.07
The current structure should be expanded	45	3.41	1.22
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	48	1.98	.96
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	15	1.36	.67
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	37	2.59	1.30

Table 4-12. Continued

Attitudes toward Fenway	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Place Rootedness			
No changes should be made to Fenway	36	2.43	1.17
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	227	3.05	.92
The current structure should be expanded	45	2.94	.97
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	48	2.26	.80
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	15	1.30	.50
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	37	2.60	.83

Scale measured on 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree

Table 4-13. Post hoc analysis for place familiarity by attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.99	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.29	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.89	0.01*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	-0.81	0.44
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-1.07	0.00*
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.99	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.30	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.10	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.18	1.00
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.08	1.00
The current structure should be expanded	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.29	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	0.30	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.40	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.48	1.00
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.22	1.00

Table 4-13. Continued

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.89	0.01*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.10	1.00
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.40	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.08	1.00
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.18	1.00
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.81	0.44
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.18	1.00
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.48	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.08	1.00
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.26	1.00
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.07	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	0.08	1.00
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.22	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.18	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.26	1.00

* *Note*: $p<.01$ indicate statistical significance.

Table 4-14. Post hoc analysis for place belongingness by attitude toward future modifications of Fenway Park

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.01	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.22	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.32	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.88	0.18
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.56	0.56
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.01	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.21	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.70	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.89	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.46	0.34
The current structure should be expanded	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.22	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	0.21	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.90	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	2.10	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.66	0.13

Table 4-14. Continued

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.32	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.70	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.90	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.20	0.01*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.24	1.00
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-0.88	0.18
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.89	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-2.10	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-1.20	0.01*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-1.44	0.00*
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.56	0.56
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.46	0.34
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.66	0.13
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.24	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.44	0.00*

* *Note*: $p<.01$ indicate statistical significance.

Table 4-15. Post Hoc Analysis for Place Identity by Attitudes toward Future Modifications of Fenway Park

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*P*
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.03	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.04	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.21	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.06	0.03
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.13	1.00
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.03	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.01	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	1.24	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	2.09	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.90	0.00*
The current structure should be expanded	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	1.04	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	0.01	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	1.25	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	2.10	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.91	0.00*

Table 4-15. Continued

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*P*
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-0.21	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.24	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.25	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.85	0.15
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.34	1.00
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-1.06	0.03
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-2.09	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-2.10	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.85	0.15
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-1.19	0.01*
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.13	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.90	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.91	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.34	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.19	0.01*

Note: $p<.01$ indicate statistical significance.

Table 4-16. Post hoc analysis for place dependence by attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modification of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.73	0.01*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.46	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.98	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.60	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.36	1.00
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.73	0.01*
	The current structure should be expanded	0.28	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	1.71	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	2.33	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	1.09	0.00*
The current structure should be expanded	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.46	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.28	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	1.43	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	2.05	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.82	0.02

Table 4-16. Post hoc analysis for place dependence by attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modification of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-0.98	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.71	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.43	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.62	0.91
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.61	0.18
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-1.60	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-2.33	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-2.05	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.62	0.91
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-1.23	0.01*
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-0.36	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.09	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.82	0.02
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.61	0.18
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.23	0.01*

* *Note*: $p<.01$ indicate statistical significance.

Table 4-17. Post hoc analysis for place rootedness by attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
No changes should be made to Fenway Park	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.64	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.52	0.18
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.15	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.11	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.19	1.00
Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.64	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	0.12	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.79	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.75	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.45	0.08
The current structure should be expanded	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.52	0.18
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.12	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.68	0.01*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.64	0.00*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	0.34	1.00

Table 4-17. Continued

(I) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	(J) Attitudes Future Modifications of Fenway Park	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-0.15	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.79	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.68	0.01*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	0.96	0.01*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-0.34	1.00
Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	-1.11	0.00*
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-1.75	0.00*
	The current structure should be expanded	-1.64	0.00*
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	-0.96	0.01*
	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	-1.30	0.00*
Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium	No changes should be made to Fenway Park	0.19	1.00
	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations	-0.45	0.08
	The current structure should be expanded	-0.34	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design	0.34	1.00
	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark	1.30	0.00*

* *Note*: $p<.01$ indicate statistical significance

Table 4-18. Place bonding differences between attitude toward future modifications of Fenway Park

	Attitude Toward Fenway Park Modifications					
Dependent Variable	No changes should be made to Fenway Park (N = 36)	Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations (N = 228)	The current structure should be expanded (N = 45)	Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design (N = 48)	Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark (N = 15)	Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium (N = 37)
Place Familiarity	2.57b,c,d,f	$3.56_{d,e}$	$3.86_{d,e}$	3.46_{a}	3.38	3.64_{a}
Place Belongingness	2.71b,c	3.73d,e	3.93d,e	$3.03_{a,d,e}$	1.83f	$3.27_{a,d,e}$
Place Identity	2.64b,c,e	3.67d,e,f	3.67d,e,f	2.42_{d}	1.58f	2.77_{b}
Place Dependence	2.95b,d,e	3.68d,e	3.41d,e	1.98f	1.36f	$2.59_{a,b}$
Place Rootedness	2.41b,e	3.05d,e	2.94d,e	2.26e	1.30f	2.60_{b}

Note: Means with a different superscripted letter (a, b, c, d, e, f) are significantly different at the .01 level.
Items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This study was designed to enhance understanding of the relationships between attitudes toward future potential modifications of Fenway Park and measures of place bonding, nostalgia, and fan identification. The results not only empirically verified a relationship between the variables of interest, but also suggest future avenues for research, which are discussed in this chapter.

Attitudes toward Future Modifications of Fenway Park

This study showed more respondents favored retaining the current structure of Fenway Park with minor upgrades or renovations. The option favored by the least number of respondents was to demolish the existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark. The second most popular option (but by a much smaller number of respondents than the most popular option) was to demolish the existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway Park. This substantial difference in numbers of those supporting the most popular response and the second most popular response indicates that a moderate majority of people are happy with the current approach team management is taking towards Fenway Park, which is to upgrade and renovate, but not make major changes to the stadium. The third most popular response was that no changes should be made to Fenway Park, which is not something that team management would likely be very receptive to, as most renovations tend to increase seating capacity and increase revenues. Two responses tied for fourth with a low number of votes. Each of these responses would likely have significant issues if team management attempted to carry them out. The first of these, the “Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium” option is not very realistic based on the price

and availability of real estate in downtown Boston. Tours of Fenway Park are well attended but they are not going to generate enough revenue to pay for maintenance of a stadium-museum. In addition, the current team owners also own the stadium and it is reasonable that they would want the revenue from the land that the stadium sits on to help finance a new stadium. The second of the least popular options, the "Current stadium should be expanded" also has issues, as Fenway Park is built in a very congested part of Boston's downtown with city streets bordering it on all four sides. Many seasons, management attempts to squeeze in a few more seats, but if there was room available to expand the footprint of the ballpark, they would have most likely attempted to do so by now.

These results support the findings of previous research (Lee, et al., 2007; & Williams & Vaske, 2003) which suggests that people tend to bond with recreational facilities. It appears that many residents of Greater Boston have bonded with Fenway Park and do not want to see it replaced, but if it is to be replaced, they want it to be replaced with a replica of Fenway Park. This suggests that Fenway Park has features that many but not all Greater Boston residents do not want to lose.

Fan Identification

Results show that the majority of respondents reported being highly identified with the Boston Red Sox team. Surprisingly, more respondents reported low identification with the Boston Red Sox than reported a medium level of identification based on Wann's categorization of fan identification levels (Wann, 2000). This may be the result of there not being much middle ground in the region regarding the Red Sox.

It is worth asking how fans come to identify with a particular sport or team. Wann, et al. (1996) found a variety of reasons for original interest in a team, including (in order

of importance) parental interest in a team, talent of the team players, geography, the influence of friends, and the success of the team. Comparably, Jones, (1997) found similar reasons for identifying with a particular team, although not necessarily in the same order as Wann, et al. For example, Jones found that geographical location was the predominant reason given for being a fan of a team. End, et al. (2002) found that the success of a team was the primary reason for team identification.

The aim of this study was not to determine the reason for participants' identification with the Red Sox, but rather to measure it as a dependent variable in relation to the independent variable, respondent's attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park. Regardless of the reasons for initial identification with a team, this study, using ANOVA and MANOVA testing, found that fan identification was the strongest variable when it came to predicting attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park. This study suggests that fan identification was the most important variable in predicting attitudes towards Fenway Park, but did not suggest what led to higher levels of fan identification. These results might be indicating that many but not all residents of Greater Boston consider all things related to the team important, especially the stadium in which the team plays. If some residents of Greater Boston view Fenway Park as an integral part of the team's history, they may also view the ballpark as something that makes their team and city special and different from other teams and cities.

The results indicate that a majority of highly identified fans wish to keep Fenway Park as it is. This might be related to the large amount of advertising the team does, which is aimed at members of RSN and features Fenway Park. The moderate sized

numbers that desire to the see the “construction should be expanded” had the highest mean fan identification score, suggesting that the most strongly identified fans understand that even though they love Fenway Park, it is not adequate to meet the team’s needs. Finally, the group indicating the park should be a museum and a new stadium built also had relatively high fan identification scores, suggesting that some highly identified fans understand the need for a new stadium, but do not want to give up their attachment to the old ballpark. As would be expected, those respondents with less favorable attitudes toward the park demonstrate lower fan identification scores consistent with previous findings suggesting sense of loyalty is tied to level of fan identification (Gwinner & Swanson, 2003).

There are a total of five unique instances identified by the post-hoc analysis where group differences are sufficiently robust to be considered as significantly different, statistically. Contrary to expectations, the group believing that no changes should be made to Fenway had statistically lower levels of fan identification than the group suggesting minor upgrades and the group suggesting the current structure should be expanded. This may result from the fact that this group has used Fenway Park less than other groups. Based on previous research relating to fan identification levels, it was anticipated that the group believing that no changes should be made to Fenway Park would have the highest levels of fan identification. As expected, based on previous research (Fink et al., 2002; Murrel & Deitz, 2002; Wann & Branscombe, 1983), the segment who believe the park should be demolished and a new one built had significantly lower fan identification mean scores than three other groups, including respondents believing the current structure should be retained with minor upgrades, the

current structure should be expanded, and Fenway should be a museum and another stadium built. These results may indicate that the higher an individual's level of fan identification is, the less likely they are to support the idea of getting rid of Fenway Park without retaining it as a museum, if it becomes too outdated to continue using as a major league stadium.

Identity theory defines identity as a set of meanings applied to the self in a social role or situation that defines what it means to be who one is (Burke, 1991). This study suggests that the identity of the Red Sox fan and the strength of that identity may influence how individuals feel about their surroundings, Fenway Park in particular. Burke further posits that these identities are tied to roles such as being a member of the RSN and that identity are organized in a salience hierarchy, meaning that choices are based on the salience of the identity. This line of thinking fits with the results of this study, as the salience of an individual's identity as a Red Sox fan seems to influence that individual's decisions regarding future modifications of Fenway Park.

Nostalgia Level in Regards to Fenway Park

This study sought to determine if nostalgia was a major factor in determining attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park, or if other factors were important. The results indicate that attitudes towards Fenway Park were not an influential factor regarding respondent's levels of nostalgia. The more important variable that influenced how they felt about future modifications of Fenway Park was the strength of their identification with the Boston Red Sox team, followed by their level of place bonding to Fenway Park. Even though nostalgia was a major factor in determining respondents' attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park, results indicated that none of the nostalgia statements yielded results where the disagree and strongly disagree

responses equaled or outnumbered the agree and strongly agree responses. This suggests that while nostalgia attitudes towards Fenway Park were not a major factor in determining levels of nostalgia towards Fenway Park, a majority of respondents felt very nostalgic towards Fenway Park. Similar to Wilson (2004), participants indicated strongly that they felt the ball park reminded them of the past and evoked fond memories. Since both Wrigley Field and Fenway Park, the two oldest facilities in use by Major League Baseball teams, have not seen many championships in the time frame being referenced, it stands to reason that the fond memories have to do with the social aspects of past experiences, as well as the ballpark itself. Fairley (2003) found group-based nostalgia can play a significant role in fan travel behavior as well as repeat purchases related to the team. In both cases, Wrigley Field and Fenway Park, the stadium has become a venerated part of the community without having the luxury of championship seasons to attract and keep fans. It may be that loyal fan bases came to care more about other aspects of the shared experience than about supporting only winning teams. Perhaps the maxim “strength through adversity” also is relevant here? Also similar to Wilson’s findings, being reminded of the good old days scored the lowest among participants. This might be due to the fact that neither stadium has had many happy memories to reflect back on. Normally, a winning team is needed to fill a ballpark on a regular basis. Winning traditionally increases fan interest and increases ticket sales but in the case of both Wrigley Field and Fenway Park, fans have remained loyal despite the teams’ frequent on-field failures. Jones (2000) found that fans will continue to support a team that is not successful if they are highly identified with the team or if their association with the team provides them with a strong social identity.

While some might believe that younger people are not old enough to reflect on their past and feel nostalgic, Gammon (2002) posited that nostalgia is not a concept reserved for the middle aged and older. Continuing developments in technology, which have led to less human interaction and more economic upheaval, have changed society and led to even young people reminiscing about the past and a “different” time. Davis (1979) posited that a nostalgic perspective could serve to minimize the shocks of rapid historical changes, such as wars, economic recessions, and natural catastrophes, all of which have been prominent in the news in recent years. The influence of nostalgia might also serve as a forced downtime or chance to escape from reality during uncertain times (Wilson, 1999). This theme suggests that current nostalgic feelings should be relatively high among participants due to recent uncertain economic times, and this was the case.

Dann (1994) posits that businesses, especially the tourism industry, have targeted people who are seeking a nostalgic experience. He further suggests that in some cases, sites have spent large sums of money to create a nostalgic atmosphere. Fenway Park is considered a historic ball field and celebrated its 100th anniversary in 2012. No attempts have been made to create an inauthentic nostalgic atmosphere since such an atmosphere exists naturally at the stadium. In fact, most renovations have attempted to modernize the facility (Appendix D). The recent successful advent of entire television channels or webcasts devoted to showing re-runs of time honored sports classics from different eras suggest a strong linkage between sports fans and nostalgia (Gammon, 2002). Classic Red Sox games are frequently shown on the New England Sports Network (NESN). Pascal et al. (2002), posit that the use of nostalgia can have a positive

effect on brand image, but Holak and Havlena (1998) caution that nostalgia is a difficult emotion for a business market to predict. The frequent use of classic footage in Red Sox advertisements suggests that the Red Sox organization believes that nostalgia is a strong selling point for their organization.

Sharing special places that have special meaning is consistent with studies about Cooperstown, home of the National Baseball Hall of Fame, where a large proportion of visitors are fathers and grandfathers sharing the nostalgia of the sport with their sons and grandsons (Newman, 2001; Snyder, 1991). Given the 86 year period between championships that the Red Sox experienced, it seems likely that a devotion to Red Sox and Fenway Park was passed down from generation to generation and was based on factors besides championships teams.

Those with the highest levels of nostalgia scores showed attitudes relating to performing minor or some level of expansion of the current stadium or converting the stadium to a museum prior to replacement. This suggests that the more nostalgic one feels about the stadium, the less likely one is to support making changes to it. Respondents reporting an indifference to the current stadium (i.e., preferring a new ballpark) had the lowest nostalgia scores, perhaps suggesting that these participants were more practical in nature, seeing functionality and comforts as more important than sentiment.

Analysis revealed a total of seven unique group-wise differences in levels of nostalgia among respondents with varying levels of Fenway Park attitudes. First, respondents who indicated “no changes should be made to Fenway Park” had lower levels of aggregate nostalgia scores than respondents with the following attitudes:

“current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations” and “the current structure should be expanded.” The latter two groups had nearly identical levels of nostalgia, perhaps indicating that some other variable is influencing their decision, as one would expect to see that the more nostalgic an individual is towards Fenway Park, the less likely they are to support it being modified. Next, groups of respondents that were open for demolishing the stadium, “demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design” and “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark,” had lower levels of nostalgia than respondents feeling the “current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations.” This makes sense, as one would expect to find more support for demolishing the stadium among those that held less nostalgic feelings towards it. Similarly, the group suggesting “the current structure should be expanded” also had higher levels of nostalgia than the two groups open to demolishing the park. Finally, the group whose attitude is that it is best to leave “Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium” had higher levels than one group open to demolishing the park, “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark”. In sum, essentially, respondents whose attitude that Fenway should be expanded, upgraded, or held as a historical treasure, clearly report higher levels of nostalgia for the park than groups who are open to demolishing the park, even for the group wanting a Fenway redesign. This makes sense on an intuitive level that the more nostalgic an individual is towards something, the less likely they would be support demolishing it or replacing it with something different. Holbrook and Schindler (2003) found support for this trend when their research suggested that intangible practices and feelings strengthen the bond that people form with tangible objects such

as professional sport facilities. Acharya, Paudel, and Hatch (2009) and Hendee, Stankey, and Lucas (1990) found similar results in a recreational setting. Their findings suggest that the nostalgia effect played a role in determining demand for and feelings towards a wilderness attraction, offering support for the premise that nostalgia is related to recreational settings.

Place Bonding

Research has suggested that users of recreational sites or facilities may form bonds based on their satisfaction with the location as a means to achieve their recreational objectives or based on social experiences that take place there (Lee, 2009). Stedman (2003) concluded that place attachment can be predicted by various constructs, including physical environment. Driver (2008) suggests that by gaining a better understanding of the benefits visitors attain from a site and how they develop their attachment to that site, management can better plan for positive experiences for visitors and facilitate the development of bonds. Across the five dimensions of place bonding, results from this study, suggested that place familiarity and place belongingness had the strongest attachment characteristics among the respondents.

A general conclusion can be drawn that, from a multivariate perspective, place bonding dimensions do differ across Fenway attitude groups. Overall, the “no changes should be made to Fenway Park,” which has the lowest dimension score across all five dimensions, is statistically different from all other group scores with the exception of the “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” attitude group.

Post hoc analyses reveal that there are differences on the place belongingness dimension per attitude group, offering support for previous findings that individuals form deeply meaningful relationships with places and these relationships hold value in their

lives and how they view their surroundings (Moore & Scott, 2003). In general, the less likely a respondent is to support demolishing the stadium, the higher their place belonging score is, with the exception of the no change attitude group having a score that is lower than the “current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations” and “the current structure should be expanded” groups. This may be explained by the mediating factor of the reality of the situation, as even those that love Fenway Park might be realistic enough to support the idea that it needs renovations and perhaps expansion. The latter two groups also have statistically higher scores than the “demolish the stadium” attitude groups. Finally, the group “leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium” has a statistically higher score than the “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” group, suggesting that even if an individual with a strong sense of place belonging supports the building of a new stadium, they want the old structure preserved as a museum. Bale (2003) posits that it might be the architecture of an older sport facility that evokes a strong sense of structural nostalgia, perhaps explaining why people would want to retain Fenway Park as a museum, so that its unique architecture might be enjoyed by future generations. In research on recreational settings, Hammitt, Backlund, and Bixler (2006), found strong significant support for place bonding with recreational settings. Their findings support the prior findings of Milligan (1998) who posited that a person’s interactions with a recreational setting do not need to be extreme for a bond to form.

For the place identity dimension per attitude toward modification group, it can be noted that the two groups wanting to retain the current structure (“current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations” and “the current structure

should be expanded”) have statistically higher scores than all other groups, suggesting that individuals who are more likely to favor retaining the present structure are more highly identified with Fenway Park. It can also be observed the no change group had a statistically different mean score from the “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark,”’ whereby the former group’s mean score was statistically higher again, suggesting that individuals with higher place identification scores are less likely to support demolishing the stadium. In a related finding, Williams and Patterson (1996) and Bricker and Kerstetter (2000) found support for the identity and symbolic bonding that recreationists develop with outdoor settings.

For the place dependence dimension, the “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” group has a mean score that is statistically lower than all other groups, with the exception of “demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway’s design” group, which suggests that those who are more likely to favor demolishing the stadium have a lower place dependence score. The two groups wanting to retain the current structure again have similar scores and are statistically different from the “demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design” and “leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium.” According to Williams et al. (1992), place dependence relies on the functionality of a recreational setting; as a result, bonding with recreational settings in terms of place dependence may be infrequent in occurrence but very strong in intensity.

For the place rootedness dimension, as has been observed in other dimensions, the “retain the stadium” groups had statistically higher scores than both the “demolish the stadium” groups. There were also statistically significant differences between the no

change group and the “current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations” and “demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark” groups. These results suggest that even though a pattern exists of individuals being in favor of retaining the current structure reporting higher place rootedness scores, differences exist between how participants with higher scores wish to retain the current structure. Milligan (1998) posits that to acquire a sense of place rootedness in a recreational context, one may need only to recreate in a particular place used or spoken about by one’s significant relations. In these situations, ‘recreation place’ takes on greater significance than the present situation might offer, as its psychological bonds and meanings are based in the past.

Research suggests a complex interaction between personal and sociocultural factors (Gartner 1889, Echtner & Ritchie 1983) and these findings support the complexity of the relationship between persons and places. Overall, the findings support the contention that the stronger one bonds with place, in this case Fenway Park, the less likely one is to support replacing it. These findings support Relph’s (1976) theory that places become important to people for complex reasons, which may cause people to advocate positions that do not make sense on a practical level. Similar to Jorgenson and Stedman (2001), the current findings support the multidimensional nature of place bonding as a number of the dimensions tested impacted participants attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park.

Implications of the Study

Not enough is known regarding what residents of Greater Boston or the RSN thinks about certain key issues like future potential modifications of Fenway Park. In a more specific sense, little is known about how the interaction of certain variables such

as nostalgia, fan identification, and place bonding affects feelings towards a sports facility and key behaviors such as ticket purchases and game attendance.

Linking fan identification to a sports facility is beneficial in helping to determine why people visit the facility. If they are coming to enjoy the facility and do not have much identification with the home team, then team management does not need to be as concerned with fielding a winning team. If the fans feel little or no attachment to a facility, but have a high identification with the team, then team management needs to concentrate its resources on fielding a competitive team rather than improving its facility. In the case of Fenway Park, for some fans (perhaps even the majority), it seems that the stadium is as important as the team's performance.

According to Davis (1979), in a time particularly riddled with uncertainty, change, and instability, many people are looking to escape back to a childhood that seemed simpler and less intimidating. The combination of sport and nostalgia, two well-known escape mechanisms, offers an escape to the "past" that some people are looking for and the relationship between the two needs to be better understood. This study focused on an authentic nostalgic sport venue which has the ability to attract visitors based on historic value alone. Gammon (2002) posits that many recreations of the past have been successful at marketing a nostalgic feeling without being authentic, but Redfoot (1984) cautions that some individuals are not satisfied with this "staged authenticity" and seek out a more realistic traditional experience. Venues such as Fenway Park have the potential to create revenue, by marketing a nostalgic experience as well as selling nostalgic items, but also offer authentic nostalgic experiences at an affordable price without investing large sums of money to recreate the past. Wilson (2004) found that

nostalgia was associated with families wanting to take stadium tours of Wrigley Field, a stadium similar to Fenway Park.

There is little known about the relationship between place attachment/bonding and sports facilities. Recent research dealing with people's place attachment to recreational settings has suggested that time and experiences in a place are important for deepening the emotional ties central to person-place relationships (Low & Altman, 1992, Moore & Graefe, 1994, & Relph, 1976). Little research has dealt with sport facilities. Smaldone, Harris, and Sanyal (2008) posit that little in-depth research has studied time and experience factors and the role they play in the place attachment equation. By dealing with a sport facility's relationship to time and experience variables simultaneously, this research offers a unique but important perspective on the relationship between place attachment/bonding and an iconic sport facility. If time is a key variable in establishing a strong sense of attachment to a place, it would behoove team management to attempt to ensure that children have positive and memorable experiences at their stadium. This might lay a potential foundation for a future generation of paying supporters, as research has revealed that a consumer's early experiences play a significant role in forming lifelong attachments and determining brand favorites (James, 1997; Karastamatis, 2009; Schindler & Holbrook, 2003). Such studies imply that understanding place attachment/bonding may enable teams to help insure a long term strong fan base if they can facilitate children and young adults bonding with their sport facility.

The implications of these findings for the future of stadiums suggest that stadium owners should consider that winning championships might lead to short-term bumps in

attendance, but it takes more than that to build a strong long-term relationship with a fan base. This study suggests that building fan identification is a key component to building loyalty toward a stadium. The results further suggest that the more an individual identifies with the Red Sox as a team, the more important preserving Fenway Park is to them, perhaps indicating that many fans view the ballpark and the team as a single entity. In addition, finding ways to encourage fans to bond with the stadium and make the stadium a part of the community are good ways to build a loyal fan base. It takes time for nostalgic feelings to develop, but insightful stadium managers can encourage the development of these nostalgic feelings by hosting family oriented activities. It might also help if the stadium is unique and a part of a downtown community.

The theoretical implications of this study for social identity theory are that further support is provided for the contention that social interactions are important factors in the decision making processes of sports fans. In turn, this supports Wann's (2000) notion that to understand sports fan behavior, one must understand sports fans on a psychological level which includes why they interact socially as they do. Specifically, findings that suggest fans interact on a psychological level with sport facilities should encourage further investigation of this relationship. Similarly, findings suggesting that the formation of feelings towards active recreational facilities may be similar to the process that passive participation in spectator sports generate, should encourage sport researchers to make use of recreational research related to attachment to place when studying the relationship between sports fans and sporting venues. The finding, similar to Wilson (2004), that nostalgia did not have as strong a relationship to respondent's attitudes towards future modifications of Fenway Park reemphasizes the thinking that

either nostalgia is not an important variable in such decisions or nostalgia is not as well understood as we think and therefore researchers are not correctly measuring and analyzing its properties. Further examination of the cohort of respondents between 41 and 55 years old may provide a better understanding of the nostalgia concept, as this cohort was exposed to unique historical and social forces.

Recommendations for Future Research

One of the goals of this study was to contribute to the limited empirical understanding of historic sports stadiums in the academic literature. Because the focus was Fenway Park and the residents of Greater Boston and potentially members of the RSN, the sample was drawn from Boston and surrounding areas. It is suggested that comparisons be made with similar stadiums and for different sports in other parts of the country. Due to the tendency to build newer, bigger stadiums (and demolish older ones), there are not many stadiums that can match Fenway Park in terms of age, highly devoted fan base, and historical significance. In baseball, Wrigley Field is probably the only other stadium that has the longevity and highly identified fans similar to the situation in Boston. Future research should compare levels of nostalgia/place bonding at Fenway Park and Wrigley Field to determine if both stadiums evoke similar levels.

Another future potential research project would be to interview people taking the daytime Fenway Park tour and measure their levels of nostalgia, place bonding, and fan identification to see how the levels of these variables compare to the results of this study. Further research might also include examining the social aspects of Fenway Park in more detail to better understand the role that socialization plays in variables such as place attachment/bonding and fan identification.

Another avenue that should be explored further is in-depth exploration of age's role in the relationships explored in this study. It merits exploring if age was related to level of nostalgia for the respondents in this study. Perhaps the fact that a large number (43%) of respondents were between the ages of 41 and 55 suggests these respondents came of age during the pivotal decade of the 1970s. Respondents in this age range merit closer examination to attempt to better understand the potential impacts that Boston's racial issues as well as the famous games of 1975 and 1978 had on these respondents. In addition, studies have found that age has a significant effect on meanings ascribed to a place (e.g., Hidalgo & Hernandez, 2001; Kaltenborn, 1997), while socio-demographic variables such as gender, income, and education have been found to have an inconsistent relationship with place attachment across previous studies (Hidalgo & Hernandez, 2001; Kyle & Manning, 2005). It is worth exploring the data gathered by this study (and other future related studies) to see if these relationships are supported by the data.

In addition, future research should segment the low fan identity respondents and see what percent call themselves fans, compared to the percent with high fan identity respondents. Lastly, future research should consider selecting out the low fan identity respondents and then do a frequency table on distance from Fenway Park to determine if this was an explanatory variable for the low fan identity respondents and compare the results to Jones's (1997) finding that geographical location was the predominant reason given for being a fan of a team.

Delimitations

The link to participate in this study was posted on the websites of two Boston based newspapers, *The Boston Globe* and *The Boston Herald*. This may affect the

generalizability of the findings in several ways. As all of the respondents were residents of greater Boston area, based on reported zip codes, these results should be generalized only to Boston area fans or populations with similar characteristics to Boston. As this study used a web survey, the respondents' ability to complete the survey due to potential limitations such as internet access might have affected the composition of the sample, as people of certain socio-demographic characteristics might be more or less likely to use the Internet. The higher education levels of the sample may be due to both increased computer access and readership of the online versions of the two newspapers. In any given Internet community, there are undoubtedly some individuals who are more likely than others to complete an online survey about a specialized topic. These sampling issues limit researchers' abilities to make generalizations about study findings. This, in turn, limits the ability to estimate population parameters. Another issue for the current study was a likelihood that respondents would tend to be more strongly identified fans. In an attempt to limit this concern, the survey was posted as a link on the newspapers' front pages and not in the sports sections. This approach may have facilitated attracting less strongly identified fans, which provided for a more representative sample.

Another delimitation involved the composition of the sample. The sample was predominantly Caucasian (95.6%) and very well educated with high income levels. The high education level is likely due to respondents being online newspaper readers and historical analysis suggests that Red Sox fans are predominantly white. Although this limits the generalizability, the survey was posted where the target sample had access to it. It may be that the RSN is comprised of mostly members that are Caucasian, well

educated, and have high income levels. As no published data exists regard the demographic composition of RSN, it is impossible to know if this sample is representative of the wider RSN. However, based on the United States 2010 Boston census, it appears that the respondents to this survey did substantially over-represent Caucasians and under represent African-Americans, Hispanics, and Asians who reside in the Boston area but it might still accurately reflect the composition of more committed RSN members.

Limitations

To reduce the possible limitations of this study, face validity and content validity of the questionnaire were established before posting the link on the newspaper websites. Establishing face validity is an important step, as it requires that the instrument is usable and makes sense at face value. Establishing content validity helped ensure that the instrument measured the actual content domain which it was designed to measure.

The historic collapse of the Red Sox baseball team at the end of the 2011 season is a further limitation to this study. The Red Sox team set a new record for poor play in the month of September, failing to make the play offs after being one of the best teams in all of baseball for much of the season. This collapse dominated the local media for much of last two months of the season and into the early part of winter, when data were collected for this survey. As a result of this collapse and the intense media coverage, many potential respondents might have ignored the posted survey links out of anger or emotional exhaustion with the Red Sox team. In addition, disappointment with the Red Sox team's performance may have influenced responses, especially in regards to ticket purchasing plans. This might also have impacted fans' level of identification with the team due to anger and disappointment with the team's late season poor performance.

In an attempt to control for this intervening variable, data were not collected until December, which potentially gave some fans time to “cool off” and get over their anger at the way the season ended.

Conclusions

The present study emphasized the need to better understand the relationships between place bonding, nostalgia, fan identification, and attitudes towards potential renovations of a sports stadium. The results of this study suggest that both fan identity and place bonding significantly affect how individuals feel about a stadium.

Although it was not the main focus of this research, this study also compiled a more thorough accounting of the characteristics of Greater Boston area fans and what their levels of nostalgia, place bonding, and fan identification are. The results do suggest several things about the Red Sox fans (though as noted earlier, these may not be representative findings). They tend to be Caucasian, well educated, have high levels of income, and are fairly evenly spread through the age categories. They tend to be strongly attached to Fenway Park and have nostalgic feelings towards it. These findings will aid future researchers in understanding the utility of these variables as they relate to an older but iconic stadium. Fenway Park is part of the Boston community, a relationship that has been strengthened by recent multipurpose events held at the stadium. However, it is likely that the stadium cannot be used indefinitely. At some point the owners will need to decide what to do when the structure becomes obsolete. Knowing what the members of the RSN want and why they want what they do will aid team ownership in being prepared to make educated decisions. Moore and Scott (2003) found that levels of attachment were positively related to levels of involvement in recreational settings. The results of this study suggest that place bonding may be

positively related to involvement with a team or stadium. Owners would be wise to consider the importance of place bonding when making decisions regarding Fenway Park's potential changes.

As much as this study revealed about Greater Boston's citizens and their attitudes toward future modifications of Fenway Park, there is much that still needs to be investigated if a fuller understanding of these fans is to be learned. Aside from the drama and entertainment that fans experience at Fenway Park, results indicate that they might also be experiencing escape through nostalgic feelings and aesthetic pleasure from the stadium itself and important social experiences. There are many more studies to do before the relationship between these variables of interest and feelings towards a sports stadium are more fully understood, but this study provides a stepping stone towards better understanding these complex relationships. Boston is one of the few cities where one can study the relationship between a highly identified fan base and a historically significant sports stadium, consequently further research involving Fenway Park may lead to a better understanding of this relationship. Once this complex relationship has been more thoroughly examined in Boston the findings can be compared to other cities and sporting stadiums.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY PARTICIPANT LETTER

Red Sox Survey

Dear Participant:

The purpose of this survey is to understand people's experiences with Fenway Park, the Red Sox, and their opinions regarding Fenway Park's future. This study is being conducted by Dan Sargeant, a doctoral student in the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport

Management at the University of Florida, and a longtime Boston resident.

The questionnaire will take 10-15 minutes to complete. You do not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer, and you are free to discontinue participation at any time without consequence. No compensation for your participation is available.

All information, which you provide, is completely anonymous and confidential to the extent provided by the law.

If you have, questions about this study please contact Dan Sargeant, University of Florida, Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport Management at djs24@ufl.edu or my supervisor Dr. Heather Gibson at hgibson@hhp.ufl.edu – 352-392-4042x1249.

If you have concerns about your rights as a research participant in the study, please contact the UFIRB Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; ph (352) 392-0433.

Your time and assistance is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your input and opinions

By clicking the "I accept" button, you agree to participate in the study as described.

I Accept

APPENDIX B
SURVEY

Part A: Please click on the number representing your degree of fanship associated with the Red Sox when answering the next set of questions.

Please answer each of the following questions by indicating the most accurate number (i.e., response) to each item.

1. **How important is it to you that the Red Sox win**?

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

2. **How much of a Red Sox fan are you**?

   Not at All a Fan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Very Much a Fan

3. **During the season, how closely do you follow the Red Sox via any of the following: in person, on television, on the radio, televised news, online or a newspaper?**

   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Almost Every Day

4. **How important is being a Red Sox fan to you?**

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

5. **How much do you dislike the Yankees?**

   Do Not Dislike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Dislike Very Much

6. **How often do you display the Red Sox name or insignia at your place of work, where you live, on your car, or on your clothing?**

   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Always

Part B: The next set of questions seeks to understand your experience and beliefs about Fenway Park

2. Please rate each statement on the following scale: where 1= strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I could sketch a rough layout of Fenway Park	1	2	3	4	5
I have visited Fenway Park many times and I am quite familiar with it	1	2	3	4	5
I know Fenway Park's layout very well	1	2	3	4	5
When at Fenway Park, I feel a part of it	1	2	3	4	5
I feel like I belong at Fenway Park	1	2	3	4	5
I am very attached to Fenway Park	1	2	3	4	5
Fenway Park means a great deal to me	1	2	3	4	5
I identify strongly with Fenway Park	1	2	3	4	5
No other baseball stadium compares to Fenway Park for attending a game	1	2	3	4	5
I wouldn't substitute any other stadium for Fenway for attending a baseball game	1	2	3	4	5
I get more satisfaction out of visiting Fenway Park than from visiting any other baseball stadium	1	2	3	4	5
Fenway Park is the only stadium I want to attend a baseball game in	1	2	3	4	5
I rarely attend a home game at any other major league baseball stadium other than Fenway Park	1	2	3	4	5
When I am planning to attend a MLB game, I consider only Fenway Park	1	2	3	4	5
I would consider visiting any stadium as long as the Red Sox were playing	1	2	3	4	5

3. Below are five options that have been discussed regarding the future of Fenway Park. Please choose the one option that best reflects your opinion (choose only one).

No changes should be made to Fenway Park **1**

Current structure should be retained, with minor upgrades or renovations **2**

The current structure should be expanded **3**

Demolish existing stadium and build a new stadium inspired by Fenway's design **4**

Demolish existing stadium and build a new, but different ballpark **5**

Leave Fenway Park as a museum and build a new stadium **6**

4. Please rate the following statements in relation to your feelings about Fenway Park.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
It reminds me of the past	1	2	3	4	5
It helps me recall pleasant memories	1	2	3	4	5
It makes me feel nostalgic	1	2	3	4	5
It makes me reminisce about a previous time	1	2	3	4	5
It makes me think about when I was younger	1	2	3	4	5
It evokes fond memories	1	2	3	4	5
It is a pleasant reminder of the past	1	2	3	4	5
It brings back memories of good times from the past	1	2	3	4	5
It reminds me of the good old days	1	2	3	4	5
It reminds me of good times in the past	1	2	3	4	5

Part C: This section asks you about your interactions with the Red Sox and Fenway Park.

5. Are you a Red Sox fan?

Yes No

How many years have you have been a Red Sox fan?

1-3 Years 4-6 years 7-9 years 10 or more years I am not a Red Sox fan

6. Have you been to a game at Fenway Park?

Yes No

If you answered NO please go to question 7.

If you answered YES to question 6, in what year did you last attend a game at Fenway Park? _____

If you answered YES to question 6, please indicate how many games you have attended at Fenway Park in your lifetime

1-5 6-10

11-15 16-30

31-50 More than 50

7. Which of the following best represents your purchase of Red Sox tickets for the 2011 season?

1. Season ticket holder
2. Mini-plan purchase
3. Purchase individual game tickets
4. I do not plan to purchase Red Sox tickets

8. How often do you visit Fenway Park to attend a Red Sox game during a typical season?

1. Once a year
2. 11-20 times a year
3. 2-10 times a year
4. More than 20 times a year

Part D: Background Information: A few questions about you to help us understand your responses.

9. What is your current zip code (if you live in the USA) _____

10. What country (if outside of the USA) do you live_____

11. Which Boston papers do you read most often either online or in print version? (Choose only one answer)

1. *The Boston Globe*
2. *The Boston Herald*
3. Both The *Globe* and The *Herald*
4. Neither
5. Other

12. What country (if outside of the USA) do you live? _____

13. What is your age? _____

1. 18-25
2. 26-30
3. 31-35
4. 36-40
5. 41-45
6. 46-55
7. 56-65
8. 66-75
9. 76 or older

14. Are you Male Female

15. Which <u>best</u> describes your racial background?

1. Native American
2. Asian
3. African American
4. Caucasian
5. Hispanic
6. Other _____

16. Which category best represents your TOTAL 2010 annual household income? (in US dollars)
(Please circle ONE)

1. $25,000 or less
2. $25,001 – 50,000
3. $50,001 – 75,000
4. $75,001 – 100,000
5. $100,001 – 125,000
6. $125,001 – 150,000
7. $150,001 or more

17. What is the highest level of education you have obtained? (Please circle ONE)

1. Less than high school degree
2. High school graduate
3. Associate or technical degree
4. Bachelor's degree
5. Master's degree (or professional degree)
6. Doctoral degree

18. How far in minutes do you travel to get to Fenway Park?

1. 1-20
2. 21-40
3. 41-60
4. 61-90
5. More than 90 minutes
6. I do not travel to Fenway Park

19. If you would like to add anything else about the Red Sox or Fenway please use the space provided below.

Thank you for participating

APPENDIX C
SUMMARY OF CHANGES MADE TO FENWAY PARK SINCE 1945

Year	Change
1946	Upper deck seats installed, making Fenway the first double-tiered park in Boston since the South End Grounds
1947	Arc lights installed
1976	Metric distances added; one of the very few ballparks to have them posted
1999	Auxiliary press boxes added
2003	Seats added to the Green Monster
2004	Seats added to the right field roof (Budweiser Right Field Roof)
2005	New drainage system
2005	Completed plans for the .406 Club area to become the EMC club
2006	Renovations of the luxury boxes; addition of new food concourse area; renovated bathrooms behind third base
2008	Temporary luxury boxes from the 1999 All-Star Game are removed and replaced with permanent ones at State Street Pavilion level

UF | **Institutional Review Board**
UNIVERSITY *of* FLORIDA

PO Box 112250
Gainesville, FL 32611-2250
352-392-0433 (Phone)
352-392-9234 (Fax)
irb2@ufl.edu

DATE: October 19, 2011

TO: Daniel Sargeant
1201 Concord Street
Framingham, MA 01701

FROM: Ira S. Fischler, PhD, Chair
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board 02

SUBJECT: **Approval of Protocol #2011-U-1037**

TITLE: An In-Depth Examination of Red Sox Nation: Place Attachment, Nostalgia, Fan Identification and Fenway Park's Future

SPONSOR: None

I am pleased to advise you that the University of Florida Institutional Review Board has recommended approval of this protocol. Based on its review, the UFIRB determined that this research presents no more than minimal risk to participants, and based on 45 CFR 46.117(c), An IRB may waive the requirement for the investigator to obtain a signed consent form for some or all subjects if it finds either: *(1) That the only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each subject will be asked whether the subject wants documentation linking the subject with the research, and the subject's wishes will govern; or (2) That the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.*

The IRB authorizes you to administer the informed consent process as specified in the protocol. If you wish to make any changes to this protocol, ***including the need to increase the number of participants authorized***, you must disclose your plans before you implement them so that the Board can assess their impact on your protocol. In addition, you must report to the Board any unexpected complications that affect your participants.

This approval is valid through **October 6, 2012**. If you have not completed the study by this date, please telephone our office (392-0433), and we will discuss the renewal process with you. It is important that you keep your Department Chair informed about the status of this research protocol.

ISF:dl

LIST OF REFERENCES

Abrams, R. (2003). *The First World Series and Baseball Fanatics of 1903*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Acharya, R. N., Paudel, K. P., & Hatch L. U. (2009). Impact of nostalgia and past experience on recreational demand for wilderness. *Applied Economics Letters*, 16, 449-453.

Aden, R.C. (1995). Nostalgic communication as a temporal escape: When it was a game's reconstruction of a baseball/work community. *Western Journal of Communication,* 59(1), 20-38.

Altman, I., & Low, S. (1992). *Place Attachment*, New York: Plenum.

Backlund, E. A., & Williams, D. R. (2003). *A quantitative synthesis of place attachment research: investigating past experience and place attachment.* Paper presented at the Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium (pp. 320-325). Bolton Landing, NY.

Bale, J. (1989). *Sports geography*. London: UK: E. & F.N. Spon.

Bale, J. 1991. Playing at home: British football and a sense of place. In J. Williams and S. Wagg (eds), British Football and Social Change: Getting into Europe. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Bale, J., 2003. *Sport and the City*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Beckley, T. M. (2003). The relative importance of socio-cultural and ecological factors in attachment to place. In L. E. Kruger (Ed.), *Understanding Community-Forest Relations. USFS, General Technical Report PNW-GTR-566* (pp. 105-126). Seattle? WA: USFS.

Blake, K. (2002) Colorado fourteeners and the nature of place identity. *Geographical Review* 92, 155-176.

Bonaiuto, M., Carrus, G., Martorella, H., and Bonnes, M., (2002). Local identity processes and environmental attitudes in land use changes: the case of natural protected areas. *Journal of Economic Psychology,* 23, 631-653.

Bonnes, M., & Secchiaroli, G. (1995). *Environmental Psychology: A Psycho-social Introduction*, London: Sage.

Borer, M. (2008). *Faithful to Fenway: Believing in Boston, Baseball, and America's Most Beloved Ballpark.* New York: New York University Press.

Borgatta, E. & Borgatta, M., Eds. (1992). *Encyclopedia of Sociology*. New York: MacMillan Publishers.

Boston Red Sox Attendance. (2011). Baseball-Reference.com. Retrieved from http://www.baseball-reference.com/teams/BOS/attend.shtml 2-12-2011

Boston Red Sox Homepage, (2010). Retrieved from http://boston.redsox.mlb.com/index.jsp?c_id=bos 4-16-2010

Bradley, R. (2008). *The Greatest Game: The Yankees, the Red Sox, and the Playoff of 1978.* New York: Free Press.

Branscombe, N., & Wann, D. (1991). The positive social and self-concept consequences of sports team identification. *Journal of Sports and Social Issues, 15,*115-127.

Breckler, S. J. (1984). Empirical validation of affect, behavior and cognition as distinct components of attitude, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47, 1191–1205.

Bricker, K. S. & Kerstetter, D. L. (2000). Level of specialization and place attachment: an exploratory study of whitewater recreationists. *Leisure Sciences*, 22, 233-257.

Brown, G., Raymond, C.M., 2007. The relationship between place attachment and landscape values: toward mapping place attachment. *Applied Geography,* 27 (2), 89-111.

Bruner, E. (2005). *Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bryant, H. (2002*). Shut Out: A story of race and baseball in Boston. Boston*: Beacon.

Burke, M. (2010). Red Sox have best fans in the US. *Forbes*, 8-4-2010.

Burke, P. (1991). Identity processes and social stress. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 36-49.

Carrier, D. (1986). Art and its spectators. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 45(1), 5–17.

Carter, T. (2002) On the need for an anthropological approach to sport*. Identities: Global Studies on Culture and Power,* 9, 405-422.

Chalip, L. & Costa, C. (2005). Sport event tourism and the destination brand: Towards a general theory. *Sport in Society,* 8, 218-237.

Cheng, A.S., Kruger, L.E., & Daniels, S.E. (2003). “Place” as an integrating concept in natural resource politics: Propositions for a social science research agenda. *Society and Natural Resources*, 16, 87-104.

Chidester, D. (1996). The church of baseball, the fetish of coca-cola, and the potlatch of rock 'n' roll: Theoretical models for the study of religion in American popular culture. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 64, 743-765.

Cialdini, R.B., Borden, R.J., Thorne, A., Walker, M.R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L.R. (1976).Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34,* 366–375.

Clark, J. & Stein, T. (2003). Incorporating the natural landscape within an assessment of community attachment. *Forest Science*, 49, 867-876.

Cohen, E. (2002). Authenticity, equity, and sustainability in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10,4, 267-276.

Cohen, S., & Taylor, L. (1992). Escape attempts. London: Rutledge.

Conrad, C. (1988). Work songs, hegemony, and illusions of self. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* 5, 179-201.

Crawford, G. (2004). *Consuming Sport: Fans, sport, and culture.* New York: Routledge.

Crompton, J.L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6, 4, 408-424.

Cuba, L. and D.M. Hummon. (1993). A place to call home: Identification with dwelling, community, region. *The Sociological Quarterly,* 34, 111-131.

Dame, K. (1994). *Fenway in your pocket: The Red Sox fan's guide to Fenway Park.* Providence: Dame.

Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4, 184-194.

Dann, G. (1994). "There's no business like old business": Tourism, the nostalgia industry of the future. In Theobold, W. (Ed.), Global Tourism: The next decade, 56-67.

Davis, F. (1979). Yearning for yesterday: A sociology of nostalgia. New York: The Free Press.

Demos, J. (2000). "A fan's homage to Fenway (or, why we love it when they always break our hearts), in *American Places: Encounters with History*, edited by William E. Leuchtenburg: Oxford Univ. Press.

Depkin, C. (2000). Fan loyalty and stadium funding in professional baseball. *Journal of Sports Economics,* 1, 124-138.

Dillman, D.A. (2007). *Mail and Internet Surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Driver, B.L. (2008). *Managing to optimize the beneficial outcomes of recreation*. State College, PA: Venture.

Echtner, C. & Ritchie, J. (1993). The measurement of destination image: an empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research,* 31, 2-12.

Elias, N., & Dunning, E, (1970). The quest for excitement in unexciting societies. In: G.Lu¨schen(Ed.), *The Cross-cultural Analysis of Sport and Games*, pp. 31–51. Champaign: Stipes Publishing Company.

End, C.M., Eaton, J., Campbell, J., Kretschmar, J.M., Mueller, D., & Dietz-Uhler, B.(2003). Outcome's influence on sport fans' computer-mediated attributions. *International Sports Journal, 7*(2), 128–139.

Erickson, G. (2001). *"Jesus is standing at the home Plate": Baseball and American Christianity .In Simons, W.M. & Hall, A.L. (Eds.), The Cooperstown Symposium on Baseball and American Culture.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc.

ESPN. (2011). ESPN.com. Retrieved from http://ESPN.com

Fairley, S. (2003). In search of relived social experience: Group-based nostalgia sport tourism. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17, 284-304.

Faulk, D. 2006. The process and practice of downtown revitalization. *Review of Policy Research* 23, 225-245.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations,* 7, 117-140.

Fink, J.S., Trail, G.S., & Anderson, D.F. (2002). An examination of team identification: which motives are most salient to its existence? *International Sports Journal*, Summer, 195–207.

Fisher, R.J & Wakefield, K. (1998). Factors leading to group identification: a field study of winners and losers. *Psychology and Marketing*, 15,1, 23-40.

Floyd, F., & Widaman, K. (1995) Factor Analysis in the Development and Refinement of Clinical Assessment Instruments. *Psychological Assessment,7*, 286-299.

Frost, M. (2009). *Game Six: Cincinnati, Boston, and the 1975 World Series: The Triumph of America's pastime*. New York: Hyperion.

Funk, D. and James, J. (2001). The psychological continuum model: A conceptual framework for understanding an Individual's psychological connection to sport. *Sport Management Review,* 4, 119-150.

Gammon, S. (2002). Fantasy, nostalgia and the pursuit of what never was – but what should have been. In Gammon, S. & Kurtzman, J. (Eds.), *Sport Tourism: Practices and Principles*, Eastbourne, UK: LSA Publications.

Gammons, P. (2010). Retrieved from http://insider.espn.go.com/espn/blog/index?|name=gammons_peter&action=login&appRedirect=http%3a%2f%2finsider.espn.go.com%2fespn%2fblog%2findex%3fname%3dgammons_peter5-15-2010 .

Gartner, W. (1989). Tourism image: attribute measurement of state tourism products using multidimensional scaling techniques. *Journal of Travel Research,* 28, 14-20.

Gayton, W. F., Coffin, J. L., & Hearns, J. (1998). Further validation of the sports spectator identification scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 87, 1137-11348.

Gibson, H. (1998b). Sport tourism: A critical analysis of research. *Sport Management Review*, 1, 45-76.

Gibson, H.J., Willming, C., & Holdnak, A. (2003). Small-scale event sport tourism: fans as tourists. Tourism Management, 22, 181–190.

Gieryn, T. (2000). A space for place in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 26, 463-496.

Giuliani, M. V. (2003). Theory of attachment and place attachment. In M. Bonnes, T. Lee, & M. Bonaiuto (Eds.), *Psychological Theories for Environmental Issues* (137-177). Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Giuliani, M. V., & Feldman, R. (1993). Place attachment in a developmental and cultural context, *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 13, 267–274.

Golenbock, P. (2005*). Red Sox Nation: An unexpurgated history of the Boston Red Sox*. Chicago: Triumph.

Gorman, L. (2005). *One Pitch from Glory. Champaign*, Sports Publishing.

Gross, Gross, M.J. & Brown, G. (2008). An empirical structural model of tourists and places: progressing involvement in place attachment into tourism, *Tourism Management*, 29,6, 1141-1151.

Gutlon, J. (2009). *It was never about the Babe. New York*: Skyhorse Publishing.

Gwinner, K. & Swanson, S. (2003). A model of fan identification: Antecedents and sponsorship outcomes. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 17, 275-294.

Hammitt, W. E., Backlund, E. A., & Bixler, R. D. (2006). Place bonding for recreation places: Conceptual and empirical development. *Leisure Studies*, 25, 17-41.

Hammit, W. E., Kyle, G., & Oh, C. (2009). Comparison of place bonding models in recreation resource management. *Journal of Leisure Research,* 41, 55-70.

Hardy, S. (2003*) How Boston Played: Sport, recreation, and Community*. 1865-1915. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press..

Hay R. (1998). Sense of place in a developmental context, *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 18, 5–29.

Healey, J.F. (1991). An explanation of the relationship between memory and sport. *Sociology of* Sport Journal, 8, 213-227.

Hendee, J. C., Stankey, G. H., & Lucas R. C. (1990). *Wilderness Management*. Denver, Colorado: North American Press.

Henderson, K. A., & Bialeschki, D. (2010). Evaluating leisure services: Making enlightened decisions. State College, PA: Venture.

Heider, F., (1958). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: Wiley.

Herzog, T. & Herbert, E. (2000). Cultural and developmental comparisons of landscape perceptions and preferences. *Environment and Behavior,* 32, 323-346.

Hidalgo, M. & Hernandez, B. (2001). Place attachment: Conceptual and empirical questions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 21*, 273-281.

Hocking, J. (1992). Sports and spectators: Intra-audience effects. *Journal of Communication,* 32, 100-108.

Hogg, M., Terry, D. & White, K. (1995). A Tale of two theories: A comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58,* 255-269.

Holak, S.L. & Havlena, W.J. (1998). Feelings, fantasies, and memories: An examination of the emotional components of nostalgia. *Journal of Business Research*, 42, 217-226.

Holbrook, M.B. & Schindler, R.M. (1991). Echoes of the dear departed past: Some work in progression nostalgia. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18, 330-333.

Holbrook, M.B. & Schindler, R.M. (2003). Nostalgic bonding: Exploring the role of nostalgia in the consumption experience. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 3, 107-127.

Holleran, M. (1998). *Boston's Changeful Times*. Baltimore: John Hopkins.

Huizinga, J (1971). *Homo Ludens*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hunt, J. (1975). Image as a factor in tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research* 13, 1-17.

Hunt, K., Bristol, T., & Bashaw, R. (1999). A conceptual approach to classifying sports fans. *Journal of Services Marketing,* 13, 439-452.

James, J.D. (1997). Becoming a sports fan: understanding cognitive development and socialization in the development of fan loyalty. Unpublished dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 302p.

John, G., Sheard, R., & Vickery, B. (2007). *Stadia: a design and development guide*. New York: Architectural Press.

Jones, I. (1997). The origin and maintenance of sports fan identification: A response to Wann, et al. (1996). *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 85, 257-258.

Jones, I. (2000). A model of serious leisure identification: The case of football fandom. *Leisure Studies*, 19, 283-298.

Jorgensen, B., & Stedman, R. (2001). Sense of place as an attitude: Lakeshore owner's attitudes toward their properties. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 21*, 233-248.

Kaltenborn, B. (1997). Nature of place attachment: A study among recreation homeowners in southern Norway. *Leisure Sciences*, 19, 175-189.

Kaltenborn, B. & Bjerke, T. (2002). Associations between landscape preferences and place attachment: A study in southern Norway, *Landscape Research, 27,* 381-396.

Karastamatis, P. (2009). The relationship of childhood sports fandom development and adult sports consumption behavior. Unpublished dissertation, Argosy University, Sarasota, 330p.

Klein, C. (2009). *The diehard sports fan's guide to Boston.* Boston, Union Park Press.

Kyle, G., & Chick, G. (2002). The social nature of leisure involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research,* 34, 426-448.

Kyle, G. & Chick, G. (2007). The social construction of a sense of place. *Leisure Sciences*. 29, 209-225.

Kyle, G., & Manning, R. (2005). Testing the dimensionality of place attachment in recreational settings. *Environment and Behavior*. 37, 153-177

Kyle, G.T.; Absher, J.D.; Graefe, A.R. (2003). The moderating role of place attachment on the relationship between attitude toward fees and spending preferences. *Leisure Sciences* 25, 33-50.

Lee, J., Graefe, A.R., & Burns, R.C. (2007). Examining the antecedents of destination loyalty in a forest setting. *Leisure Sciences*, 29 463-481.

Lieberman, S. (1991). The popular culture: Sport in America- a look at the avid sports fan. *The Public Perspective: A Roper Center Review of Public Opinion and Polling*, 2, 28-32.

Long, A., & Perkins, D. (2007). Community social and place predictors of sense of community: A multilevel and longitudinal analysis. *Journal of community Psychology,* 35, 563-581.

Low, S. M., & Altman, I. (1992). Place attachment: A conceptual inquiry. In I. Altman & S. M. Low, S. M. (Eds.), *Place attachment* (pp. 1-12). New York: Plenum)

MacCannell, D. (1976). The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class. New York: Schocken.

Madrigal, R. (1995). Cognitive and affective determinants of fan satisfaction with sporting event attendance. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27, 205-227.

Mason, D., Duquette, G., & Scherer, J. (2005). Heritage, sport tourism and Canadian junior hockey: nostalgia for social experience or sport place? *Journal of Sport Tourism,* 4, 253-67.

Media Nation, (2012). Retrieved from http://www.dankennedy.net/tag/boston-globe. 7-12-2012.

McCall, G. & Simmons, J.L. 1966. *Identities and Interactions*. New York: The Free Press.

McKinney, W. & Hoge, R. (1983). Community and congregational factors in the growth and decline of protestant churches. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 51-66

Mechinda, P., Serrirat, S., & Guild, N. (2009). An examination of tourist's attitudinal and behavioral loyalty: comparison between domestic and international tourists. *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 24, 117-134.

Millar, M. G., & Tesser, A. (1989). The effects of affective-cognitive consistency and thought on attitude–behavior relations, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 25,189–202

Milligan, M. J. (1998). Interactional past and potential: The social construction of place attachment. *Symbolic Interaction*, 21, 1-33.

MLB. (2011). MLB.com. Retrieved from http://mlb.mlb.com/network/shows/

Mnookn, S. (2006). Feeding the Monster: How money, smarts, and nerve took a team to the top. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Moore, R. & Graefe, A. R. (1994). Attachment in recreation settings: the case of rail-trail users. *Leisure Sciences*, 16, 17-31.

Moore, R, & Scott, D. (2003). Place attachment and context: Comparing a park and a trail within. *Forest Science,* 49, 877-884.

Morris, D. (1981). *The soccer tribe*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Murrel, A.J., & Dietz, B. (1992). Fan support of sports teams: the effect of a common group identity. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 14, 28–39.

Newman, R. (2001). The American church of baseball and the National Baseball Hall of Fame.A *Journal of Baseball History and Culture,*10, 46-55.

Norusis, M. (2000). SPSS 12.0 Statistical Procedures Companion. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Nowlin, B. (2005). *75: The Red Sox Team that Saved Baseball*. Cambridge, MA: Rounder Books.

Nowlin, B. & Desrochers, D. (2007). *The 1967 impossible dream Red Sox: Pandemonium on the field.* Cambridge, MA: Rounder Books.

Nowlin, B. & Ross, M. (2000). *Fenway Saved*. New York: Sport Masters.

Pan, D., & Baker, J. (1999). Mapping of intercollegiate sports relative to selected attributes as determined by a product differentiation strategy. *Journal of Sports Behavior*, 22, 69-82.

Pascal, V.J., Sprott, D. E. & Muehling, D.D. (2002). The influence of evoked nostalgia on consumer's responses to advertising: An exploratory study. *Journal of Current Issues and Researching Advertising,* 24, 39-49.

Patton, G. (2007, June 24). Petco Park held hostage. USA Today pp. D1, D4.

Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A. K. & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place-identity: Physical world socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3, 57-83.

Ramshaw, G. & Gammon, S. (2005). More than just nostalgia? Exploring the heritage/ sport tourism nexus. *Journal of Sport Tourism,* 10,4, 229-241.

Redfoot, D.L. (1984). Touristic authenticity, Touristic angst, and modern reality. *Qualitative Sociology*, 7, 291-309.

Redmond, G. (1991). Changing styles of sport tourism: Industry/consumer interactions in Canada, the USA and Europe. In M.T. Sinclair & M.J. Stabler (Eds.), The tourism industry: An international analysis, (pp. 107-120). Wallingford, UK: CAB International.

Red Sox Official Homepage Retrieved May8, 2009 from http://boston.redsox.mlb.com/index.jsp?c_id=bos

Reiss, S. (1999). *Touching Base: Professional Baseball and American Culture in the Progressive Era*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Relph, E. (1976). *Place and Placeness*. Cambridge: Pion.

Reynolds, B. (2009). *1978: The Boston Red Sox, a historic game, and a divided city*. New York: New American Press.

Ross, A. (2004). *The Red Sox Century*. Tennessee: Cumberland House.

Ross, M. (1973). Football and baseball in America. In J. Talimini & C. Page (Eds.), *Sport and society*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Ryan, M. (2005). Retrieved from http://www.boston.com/news/globe/magazine/ articles/2005/04/03/isnt_it_time_we_said_goodbye_to_fenway_park/?page=full

Schindler, R. M., & Holbrook, M. B. (2003). Nostalgia for early experience as a determinant of consumer preferences. Psychology & Marketing, 20, 275-302.

Schroeder, H. (2007). Place experience, gestalt, and the human-nature relationship. *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 27(4), 293-309.

Schudson, M. (1989). How culture works: Perspectives from media studies on the efficacy of symbols. *Theory and Society*, 18,170.

Segrave, J.O. (2001). Sport as escape. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 24,1, 61 -78.

Shank, M. & Beasley, F. (1998). Fan or fanatic: Refining a measure of sports involvement. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 21, 435-450.

Shaughnessy, D. (1996). *At Fenway: Dispatches from Red Sox Nation*. New York: Crown.

Shaughnessy, D. (1999). *Fenway: A Biography in Words and Picture*. Boston: Mifflin.

Sloan, L.R. (1979). The function and impact of sports for fans: a review of theory and contemporary research. In J. Goldstein (Ed.), *Sports, games & play*, pp. 219–262. New York: Wiley.

Smaldone, D., Harris, C., & Sanyal, N. (2008). The role of time in developing place meanings. *Journal of Leisure Research,* 40, 479-504.

Smith, C. 2003. Storied Stadiums: Baseball's History through Its Ballparks. Cambridge: Da Capo Press.

Smith, S. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-31751_162-20072924-10391697.html

Smock, C. & Holt, B. (1962). Children's reactions to novelty: An experimental study of "curiosity motivation", *Child Development* 33, 631–642.

Snyder, E.E. (1991). Sociology of nostalgia: Sport halls of fame and museums in America. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8, 228-238.

Snyder, C.R., Lassegard, M., & Ford, C.E. (1986). Distancing after group success and failure: Basking in reflected glory and cutting off reflected failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(August), 382–388.

Stedman, R. C. (2002). Toward a social psychology of place: Predicting behavior from place-based cognitions, attitude, and identity. *Environment and Behavior, 34,* 561–581.

Stedman, R. C. (2003). Is it really just a social construction?: The contribution of the physical environment to sense of place. *Society & Natural Resources, 16*, 671-685.

Stegner, W. (1992). *The Sense of Place.* New York: Random House.

Stewart, B., Smith, A., & Nicholson, M. (2003). Sport consumer typologies: a critical review. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 12(4), 206–216.

Stokowski, P. (2002). Languages of place and discourses of power: Constructing new senses of place. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34, 368-382.

Stryker, S. (1968). Identity theory and role performance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *30*, 558–564.

Sutton, W.A., McDonald, M.A., Milne, G.R., & Cimperman, A.J. (1997). Creating and fostering fan identification in professional sport. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 6,1, 15–29.

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2006). Using Multivariate Statistics. Fifth Edition. New York: Harpers Collins Publishers, Inc.

Tager, T. (2001). *Boston Riots: Three centuries of social Violence*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Tajifel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall

Tangen, J.O. (2004) Embedded expectations, embodied knowledge and the movements that connect: A system theoretical attempt to explain the use and non-use of sport facilities, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport,* 39, 7–25.

Taylor, J. (1991). Authenticity and sincerity in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28, 1, 7-26.

Things to do in Boston, (2010). Retrieved fromhttp://www.hiltonfamilyboston.com/thingstodoinboston/attractions.php. 2-16-2010.

Thompson, K. (2002). *Emile Durkheim*. New York: Routledge.

Trail, G., Anderson, D.F., & Fink, J.S. (2000). A theoretical model of sport spectator consumption behavior. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 1, 154–180.

Trentelman, C. (2009). Big, smelly, salty lake that I call home: Sense of place with a mixed amenity setting. Dissertation presented to the graduate school of Utah State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology. Utah State University, Logan, 270p.

Trujillo, N. 1992. Interpreting (the work and the talk of) baseball: Perspectives on ballpark culture. *Western Journal of Communication,* 56, 4, 350-371.

Trujillo, N. 1994. Emotionality in the stands and in the field: Expressing self through baseball *Journal of Sport & Social Issues,* 18, 303-325.

Urry, J. (2002). The Tourist Gaze. 2nd ed. London: Sage.

Uzzel, D. (1989). The hot interpretation of War and Conflict. In Heritage Interpretation: The Natural and the Built Environment, D. Uzzel, ed. London: Belhaven.

Vaccaro, M. (2005). *Emperors and Idiots: The Hundred-Year Rivalry between the Yankees and the Red Sox*. New York: Random House.

Wakefield, K. (1995). The pervasive effects of social influence of sporting event attendance. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues,* 19, 335-351.

Wann, D.L. (1995). Preliminary validation of the Sport Fan Motivation Scale. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 19, 377–396.

Wann, D.L. (1997). *Sports psychology.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wann, D. L. (1998) A preliminary investigation of the relationship between alcohol use and sport fandom. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal,* 26, 287-295.

Wann, D. L. (2001). *Sport Fans: The Psychology and Social Impact of Spectators.* New York: Routledge.

Wann, D. L. (2006). Examining the potential casual relationship between sport team identification and psychological well-being. *Journal of Sport Behavior,* 29, 79-95.

Wann, D. L., Bayens, C. & Driver, A. (2004). Likelihood of attending a sporting event as a function of ticket scarcity and team identification. *Sport Marketing Quarterly,* 2004,13, 209-215

Wann, D. L. & Branscombe, N. (1993). Sports fans: Measuring degree of identification with the team. *International Journal of Sport Psychology,* 24, 1-17.

Wann, D. L., & Dolan T. (1994). Attributions of highly identified sports spectators. *Journal of Social Psychology,* 134, 783-792.

Wann, D. L., Grieve, F. G., Zapalac, R.K., & Pease, D. G. (2008). Motivational profiles of sports fans of different sports. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 17,1, 6-19.

Wann, D.L., Melnick, M.J., Russell, G.W., & Pease, D.G. (2001). *Sport fans: The psychology and social impact of spectators*. New York: Routledge.

Wann, D. L., Royalty, J. & Roberts, A. (2000). The self-presentation of sport fans: Investigating the importance of team identification and self-esteem. *Journal of Sport Behavior,* 23,198-206.

Wann, D.L. & Schrader, M.P. (2000). Controllability and stability in the self –serving attributions of sports spectators. The Journal of Social Psychology, 140, 160-168.

Wann, D. L., Tucker, M. & Schrader, M. (1996). An analysis of the stability of sport team identification. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 82, 322-340.

Wann, D. L. & Schrader, M. (1997). Team Identification and the enjoyment of watching sporting events. *Perceptual and Motor Skills,* 84, 954-969.

Wann, D.L., Schrader, M.P., & Wilson, A.M. (1999). Sport fan motivation: questionnaire validation comparisons by sport, and relationship to athletic motivation. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 22,1, 114–139.

Ward, G. & Burn, K. (1996). *Baseball an Illustrated History.* New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Warzecha, C. A., & Lime, D. W. (2001). Place attachment in Canyonlands National Park: Visitors' assessment of setting attributes on the Colorado and Green Rivers. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 19*, 59-78.

Williams, D. R., Patterson, M. E. Roggenbuck, J. W., & Watson, A. E. (1992). Beyond the commodity metaphor: Examining emotional and symbolic attachment to place. *Leisure Science*, 14, 29-46.

Williams, D. R. & Patterson M. E. (1996). Environmental meaning and ecosystem management: Perspectives from environmental psychology and human geography. *Society and Natural Resources*, 9, 507-521.

Williams, D. R., & Vaske, J. J. (2003). The measurement of place attachment: Validity and generalizability of a psychometric approach, *Forest Science* 49, 830–840.

Wilson, A. (2004). The relationship between consumer role socialization and nostalgia sport tourism: A symbolic interactionist perspective. (Unpublished Master's Thesis) University of Florida, Gainesville: 113p.

Wilson, J. (1999). "Remember when…" A consideration of the concept of nostalgia. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics, 56,* 296-304.

Wilson, N. (1990). *The sports business: the men and the money*. London: Mandarin.

Wilson, T. D., Dunn, D. S., Kraft, D., & Lisle, D. J. (1989). Introspection, attitude change and attitude-behavior consistency: the disruptive effects of explaining why we feel the way we do, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 19, 123–205.

Xiang, Z. & Gretzel, U. (2010). Role of social media in online travel information search. *Tourism Management*, 31, 179-188.

Xing, X. & Chalip, L. (2006). Effects of hosting a sports event on destination brand: a test of co-branding and match up models. *Sport Management Review,* 9, 49-78.

Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26, 45-56.

Young, M. (1999). The social construction of tourist places. *Australian Geographer* 30, 373-389.

Yung, L., Freimund, W. & Belsky, J. (2003). The Politics of place: Understanding meaning, common ground, and political difference on the Rocky Mountain frontier. *Forest Science,* 49, 855-866.

Zillmann, D., Bryant, J., & Sapolsky, B. S. (1989). Enjoyment from sports spectatorship. In J. H.Goldstein (Ed.), *Sports, games, and play: Social and psychological viewpoints* (2nd ed). (241-278). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zuckerman, M. (1984) Sensation seeking: A comparative approach to a human behavior. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences,* 7, 413-471.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Dan Sargeant attended Bishop Hendricken High School in Warwick Rhode Island. After graduation, he attended Providence College, majoring in political science. Following his graduation from Providence College, he continued his education by earning a master's degree in political science from the University of Rhode Island. While earning his master's degree, he also earned his teaching certificate to teach at the high school level. After teaching high school for several years, he taught at a program for incarcerated youth offenders.

After several years of teaching incarcerated youth offenders, he returned to school, at Castleton State College, to obtain a master's degree in forensic psychology, but before he could complete this degree, the program was terminated. He transferred some of the credits from this program towards a master's degree in criminology at the University of Florida. After completing this master's degree, he entered the Tourism, Recreation, and Sport Management graduate program at the University of Florida.

While studying at the University of Florida, his academic papers focused on dark tourism, as well as sport tourism. He received his Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Florida in the summer of 2012.