

2015

An Analysis of the Utilization of Social Media in Gridiron Football with Direct Comparison to Australian Rules Football in Addition to Respective College and Minor Leagues

Adele Schultz

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.emich.edu/honors>

Recommended Citation

Schultz, Adele, "An Analysis of the Utilization of Social Media in Gridiron Football with Direct Comparison to Australian Rules Football in Addition to Respective College and Minor Leagues" (2015). *Senior Honors Theses*. 454.
<http://commons.emich.edu/honors/454>

This Open Access Senior Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

An Analysis of the Utilization of Social Media in Gridiron Football with Direct Comparison to Australian Rules Football in Addition to Respective College and Minor Leagues

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze the use of social media in the National Football League (NFL), the Australian Football League (AFL), NCAA - Football, and the Australian minor leagues of: the Western Australian Football League, the South Australian National Football League, and the Victorian Football League. Each league had a three-month analysis, in which the results were broken up into four categories of: (1) team sponsor/partner promotional Tweets, (2) team promotion, (3) negative behavior, and (4) other. Findings illustrated that the the NFL utilized Twitter more frequently than the AFL. The NFL also Tweeted more frequently than the NCAA. However, the NCAA utilized Twitter more than the Australian minor leagues. Finally, the AFL was more efficient in Twitter use than the Australian minor leagues.

Degree Type

Open Access Senior Honors Thesis

Department

Health Promotion and Human Performance

First Advisor

Brenda Riemer

Second Advisor

Jodi Schumacher

Keywords

football, twitter, social media

AN ANALYSIS OF THE UTILIZATION OF SOCIAL MEDIA IN GRIDIRON FOOTBALL
WITH DIRECT COMPARISON TO AUSTRALIAN RULES FOOTBALL IN ADDITION TO
RESPECTIVE COLLEGE AND MINOR LEAGUES

By

Adele Schultz

A Senior Thesis Submitted to the

Eastern Michigan University

Honors College

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for Graduation

With Honors in Sport Management

Approved at Ypsilanti, Michigan, on

December 1, 2015

Brenda Riemer (Supervising Instructor)

Jodi Schumacher (Honors Advisor)

Christopher Herman (Department Head)

Rebecca Sipe (Honors Director)

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Key Words	4
Introduction.....	5
Social Media	5
Social Media in Sport.....	6
Twitter.....	7
Professional vs. Collegiate.....	8
Methodology	9
Team Selection.....	9
Data Collection	11
Associated Teams	13
Results.....	13
Category One: Sponsor/Partner Promotion.....	13
Category Two: Team Promotion.....	14
Category Three: Negative Behavior	15
Category Four: Other	15
Total Tweets.....	16
Discussion.....	17
Conclusion	18
Appendices.....	21
References.....	38

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze the use of social media in the National Football League (NFL), the Australian Football League (AFL), NCAA – Football, and the Australian minor leagues of: the Western Australian Football League, the South Australian National Football League, and the Victorian Football League. Each league had a three-month analysis, in which the results were broken up into four categories of: (1) team sponsor/partner promotional Tweets, (2) team promotion, (3) negative behavior, and (4) other. Findings illustrated that the the NFL utilized Twitter more frequently than the AFL. The NFL also Tweeted more frequently than the NCAA. However, the NCAA utilized Twitter more than the Australian minor leagues. Finally, the AFL was more efficient in Twitter use than the Australian minor leagues.

Key Words

Promotion, Social Media, Twitter, Sport, Football, Promotion

Introduction

Social Media

Kaplan and Haenlein defined social media as a “group of internet-based applications” that “allow for the creation and exchange of user generated content” online (2009, p. 93). Social media has become revolutionary in terms of connectivity and efficiency, as the opportunity to deliver messages through social media. This opportunity of connectivity and efficiency is available through the platform of immediate and direct contact with all social media users (Witkemper, Hoon Lim & Waldburger, 2012). The ability of instantaneous connection has allowed brands, organizations and companies to reach their consumers on a weekly, daily or hourly basis. The opportunity of instant outreach allows these brands, organizations and companies to precisely select when they wish to send messages and what information the message holds. This allows for a level of control over consumer knowledge. However, Filo, Lock & Karg (2015) suggests that a less explicit focus on brand management and promotion through social media is a more effective means of connecting with consumers. Not only are brands, organizations and companies able to send direct messages to their consumers, but they are also able to receive feedback straightaway. Feedback is key for success in today’s business world; to keep consumers you need to meet their needs and desires.

McCarthy (2014) illustrated that enhanced content and interaction are opportunities that come from the use of social media. As mentioned above, the enhanced interaction experience initiates from the speed of connectivity, on a personal level. Enhanced content is produced through the ability to share more information and at a faster receiving rate that social media provides.

Abreza, O'Reilly & Reid (2013) revealed some of the advantages that brands can utilize through social media, being: (1) enriched knowledge of the consumers, (2) advanced interaction, (3) effective engagement and (4) efficient use of resources. These listed advantages are reasons why brands, organizations, companies, and more specific to this study, sports teams, should utilize social media.

Social Media in Sport

A sufficient amount of time and resources is invested by sports brands into their usage online in order to engage with their virtual audience and to create and maintain online relationships (Filo, Lock & Karg, 2015). This same concept applies not only to sports brands, but also sports teams and sports organizations. The large amount of time spent by the sporting industry investing into online presence and social media is not unproductive; Broughton (2011) provided evidence of a survey in his literature review for his own research, in which revealed that 40% of fans believe that social media has increased their fandom for their given sports team. More specifically, Broughton (2010) determined that 55% of NFL fans have grown in team passion since linking themselves to the given team on Facebook and Twitter. These two statistics are vital in acknowledging the potential impact social media can have on sports teams; the more committed the fans are, the more likely they will invest into the team and its brand.

Due to the large growth in the online presences on social media, sport businesses and brands have utilized online communication with their consumers to generate revenue (Filo, Lock & Karg, 2015). Media exposure is an incentive for a means of revenue building for both the team itself and it's sponsors and partners. The potential generation of revenue through social media comes from the team's connection with their consumers. Williams and Chinn (2010) stated that social media allows sport brands to have an opportunity to add value, communicate, and network

within the consumer process. There are multiple stages of the consumption process that occurs online with consumers, some of which include: information search, decision-making, and word of mouth (Filo, Lock & Karg, 2015). All of these stages are essential in creating and maintain online relationships.

Sports organizations and athletes are increasing their social media usage and employing social media as means of communicating with their fans. Twitter allows for athletes and sporting teams to both hold online conversations with and receive feedback from fans. The key to online-relationships from a sports team to a fan is trust; by having legitimacy through a means such as an official team page positively impacts the number of team fans due to the brand trust (e.g. Pederson, Parks, Quarterman & Thibault (2010) & Pfahl, Kreutzer, Maleski, Lillibridge and Ryznar (2012)).

Rothschild (2011) discovered that the most valuable platforms to engage with consumers and potential customers for sports and entertainment venues are Facebook, Twitter and YouTube; the value coming from the ability to monitor conversations and receive feedback. This is not only relevant to sports and entertainment venues, but also for sports teams. In addition to this, the value of these servers is in direct lining to the services that Twitter provides.

Twitter

Witkemper, Hoon Lim & Waldburger (2012) defined Twitter as “a service in which users can interact with one another through the use of 140 characters” (p.170). Twitter is extensively used around the world on both a personal and professional level. Users, individual or group representation, in this case sporting teams, are able to send message of their choice to the world and their followers. According to Hopkins, Twitter can be utilized to allow for real time updates and interactivity (2013). This instant knowledge of information provides a stage in which can be

utilised in a business setting; due to Twitter's online growth, according to Witkemper, Hoon Lim & Waldburger (2012), many business organizations are forming Twitter accounts within their given marketing strategies as a technique to connect with fans. This allows for business organizations, and more specifically sporting teams, to enrich their publicity and team brand.

Sporting teams are able to benefit from social media exposure in numerous ways; Fisher (2012) found that social media platforms, like Twitter are three times more effective in terms of ticket selling through Ticketmaster than traditional marketing platforms. This is a major discovery and is evidence of the potential impact Twitter can have on sports revenue. The question remains whether collegiate sporting fans use Twitter in the same manner as professional sporting fans.

Professional vs. Collegiate

Witkemper, Hoon Lim & Waldburger (2012) found that three of the four reasons that college students use Twitter is for: (1) entertainment, (2) to find information, and (3) to boost their experience as a fan. Collegiate sport fans, more often than not, are also fans of professional teams. With this, the reasoning behind college students' use of Twitter is assumed to cross over for many other consumers of sport, both in the professional and collegiate leagues. In addition to the reasons behind student use of Twitter, Witkemper, Hoon Lim & Waldburger suggested that for an organization to further develop their relationship with their consumers, they should apply social media in a more informative manner. Based on this review, it is assumed that teams should utilize Twitter to address negative issues regarding the team and its players, in addition to advertising and promoting their sponsors and partners. The purpose of this study is to analyze the usage of social media in sports today, through Twitter. More specifically, we are analysing if negative behaviour is being addressed by teams, if teams utilise Twitter to upkeep relationships

with their sponsors and partners, and if teams engage with fans through Twitter. Despite the potential benefits Twitter can have on sporting teams being illustrated, we are left curious.

Methodology

Team Selection

The focus of the research was on the National Football League, the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) – Football, and the Australian Football Leagues and its respective minor leagues, being: the the Western Australia Football League, the Victorian Football League, and the South Australian National Football League. It was hypothesized that the National Football League and NCAA Football will utilize Twitter more effectively for each of the four categories in comparison to both the Australian Football League and the respective Australian minor leagues. When comparing the National Football League and NCAA football, NCAA football will Tweet more frequently, as will the Australian Rules Football League in comparison to the three Australian minor leagues.

Teams selection was based from the respective 2013 or 2013/2014 end of season rankings from four different sporting leagues; (1) the National Football League (NFL), USA, (2) the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) – Football, USA, (3) the Australian Football League (AFL), Australia, and (4) the Western Australia Football League/the South Australian National Football League/the Victorian Football League, Australia. Both the USA and Australia had professional representation and minor league or armature representation. The top ten teams from the end of season rankings for the professional leagues (the National Football League and the Australian Football League) were analyzed. The top six teams from the end of season rankings for the NCAA Football competition were analyzed. The top two teams from the

end of season rankings of each of the three Australian minor league teams were also analyzed.

With this, the USA and Australia both had sixteen team representations each.

The following teams represented the National Football League, as the USA major professional league (in final standing order from the 2013- 2014 season).

(1) Seattle Seahawks	(2) Denver Broncos	(3) New England Patriots	(4) San Francisco 49ers	(5) Carolina Panthers
(6) Indianapolis Colts	(7) New Orleans Saints	(8) San Diego Chargers	(9) Kansas City Chiefs	(10) Cincinnati Bengals

The following teams represented the Australian Football League, as the Australian major professional league (in final standing order from the 2013 season).

(1) Hawthorn Hawks	(2) Geelong Cats	(3) Fremantle Dockers	(4) Sydney Swans	(5) Richmond Tigers
(6) Collingwood Crows	(7) Port Adelaide Power	(8) Carlton Blues	(9) Essendon Bombers	(10) North Melbourne Kangaroos

The following teams represented NCAA Football, as the USA amateur league (in final standing order from the 2013-2014 season).

(1) Florida State	(2) Auburn	(3) Michigan State
(4) South Carolina	(5) Missouri	(6) Oklahoma

The following teams represented the Western Australian Football League (WAFL), the South Australian National Football League (SANFL) and the Victorian Football League (VFL), as the Australian minor professional leagues (in final standing order from the 2014 season).

(1) West Perth (WAFL)	(2) East Perth (WAFL)	(1) Norwood (SANFL)
(2) North Adelaide (SANFL)	(1) Box Hill Hawks (VFL)	(2) Geelong Cats (VFL)

Data Collection

Data was collected from three selected months for each team; these months stayed consistent for each respective league. For the National Football League, data was collected from November to December 2014 and January 2015; for the Australian Football League, data was collected from July to September 2014; for NCAA Football, data was collected from September to November 2014; and for the Australian minor leagues, data was collected from June to August 2014. All data, for every team, was collected through an external website other than Twitter, being Tweet Tunnel (www.tweettunnel.com); as data was unable to be collected through Twitter itself, due to it only holding a specific amount of historical Tweets available through their server, an external source was necessary. Tweet Tunnel, on the other hand, held a larger historical amount of Twitter data for each user, and therefore resulted in the data required for this research being readily available. Tweet Tunnel is a free website in which online users can enter in the specific Twitter account name and 32 pages of historical Tweets for that given team will become available. This process was used for all teams throughout the data collection stage.

The Tweets from each respective team, for each respective month were extracted from Tweet Tunnel into a PDF file and saved to an external hard drive. Once saved, the data was

analyzed and categorized into one of four categories, each in which all had three subcategories.

The categories were as follows:

- (1) Team sponsor/partner promotional Tweets. *Tweets primarily promoting a sponsor or partner.*
- (2) Team promotion. *Tweets that primarily promoted the respective team.*
- (3) Negative behavior. *Tweets focused on negative, outside of the game negative player behavior.*
- (4) Other. *Tweets that do not have a specific category.*

Each of the three subcategories for the above categories were as follows:

- (a) The Tweet was by the given team. *The author of this Tweet was the team itself.*
- (b) The Tweet was by the sponsor/partner. *The author of this Tweet was a sponsor/partner, in which was retweeted by the team.*
- (c) The Tweet was by a fan/other. *The author of this Tweet was a fan/other, in which was retweeted by the team.*

Categorization occurred by going through each tweet and manually placing each one in the given category.

Due to some teams Tweeting a large amount during certain months, the Twitter server, Tweet Tunnel did not hold all the required information, as the date accessed to the website was too late for viewing of the given Tweets. With this, some Tweets were missing for three teams; Port Adelaide – from July 1st to July 4th, Seattle Seahawks – from December 8th to December 16th and New England Patriots – from November 8th to November 12th.

Associated Teams

Two of the Australian minor league, VFL teams were directly linked to two of the Australian major league, AFL teams. The Box Hill Hawks were the minor league team for Hawthorn in the AFL and the Geelong Cats – VFL, were the minor league team for Geelong in the AFL. This potentially could have an impact on their Tweets as it is assumed that there is a crossover of fans due to the two given team's relationship.

Results

Results were placed into tables according to category and month (see appendices for all tables of results).

Category One: Sponsor/Partner Promotion

Results from month one, category one (see Appendix A), which was sponsor/partner promotion, illustrated that the NFL was the top Tweeting league, with majority of the sponsor/partner promotional Tweets being retweeted by the given sponsor/partner. Following the NFL was the AFL with the majority of their Tweets also coming from the given sponsor/partner. The NCAA was the third most efficient team in terms of sponsor/partner promotion, with both the Team and a Fan/Other having one sponsor/partner promotional Tweet each. The Australian minor leagues (WAFL/SANFL/VFL) had no sponsor/partner promotional Tweets.

For month two for category one (see Appendix E), again the NFL was the most efficient, again with most of their Tweets being retweeted by the given sponsor/partner, however a lot were also direct Tweets by the respective Teams page. This was again followed by the AFL; majority Tweets came from retweeting the given sponsor/partner,

however it was closely followed by direct Tweets from the teams. The NCAA and the Australian minor leagues were tied for least efficient; both having one sponsor/partner promotional retweet in the fan/other category.

Month three (see Appendix I), and the overall three-month combination of results, illustrated the same result standing order as month two in terms of the NFL and AFL. This was again followed by the NCAA, in which the sponsor/partner promotional Tweets' author(s) was tied with both the given sponsor/partner and the team having two Tweets each. The NCAA was followed by the Australian minor leagues, whom had no sponsor/partner promotional Tweets.

The overall Tweets for category one (Appendix M) illustrated that in terms of sponsor/partner promotion, by any author, the NFL was most efficient with 218 Tweets or retweets, followed by the AFL with 115, the NCAA with 7 and the Australian minor leagues with 1 retweet.

Category Two: Team Promotion

Results for category two, month one (see Appendix B) were similar to the findings in category one, month one; the NFL has the highest amount of team promotion Tweets, with the main author being the respective team, followed by retweets from the fan/other category and finally the least common author was retweets from the given sponsor/partner. The AFL had the second highest amount of Tweets, in which it was the same order of authors as the NFL. The AFL was followed by the NCAA and then the Australian minor leagues; both these leagues had their top team promotional author being each respective team, followed by their sponsor/partner category and finally the fan/other category.

Team promotion for month two (see Appendix F), month three (Appendix J) and the overall results (Appendix N) also followed the same pattern as month one in the same category.

Category Three: Negative Behavior

In terms of category three for month one (Appendix C), in which illustrated the addressing of negative behavior, the AFL was the only league to address this on Twitter; 57 Tweets came directly from the given team, 20 Tweets came from the AFL Tribunal in the sponsor/partner category and 1 Tweet was retweeted in the fan/other category. This resulted in a total of 78 Tweets from the AFL and zero from all other leagues.

For month two in negative behavior, three out of the four leagues analysed had data (see Appendix G). Again, the AFL was the most efficient in addressing negative behavior issue on Twitter, followed by the Australian minor leagues and then the NFL. The NCAA again had no Tweets in this category.

Three leagues also had data for month three (see Appendix K); the Australian minor leagues were the top Tweeters this month in category three, followed by the NFL and then the AFL. Again, the NCAA did not have any Tweets in the category.

Overall (see Appendix O) the AFL had the most Tweets with 106 over the 3 months, followed by the Australian minor leagues, with 6, and the NFL with 4.

Category Four: Other

The other section was made up from Tweets such as responding to fans with information about the games and issues such as game-day parking. Quizzes for the fans were a large part of many teams' other categories. There were also retweets about other major sporting events by the teams and tragedies such as flight MH17.

The NFL had the most Tweets/retweets for month one (Appendix D); majority of these Tweets came directly from the respective teams, followed by retweeting from fans. The AFL had the second most Tweets in this category, and despite the majority of these coming from the given teams, like the NFL, both the sponsor/partner and fan/other author categories drew in terms of number of retweets. The NCAA followed the AFL, leaving the Australian minor leagues to have the least number of Tweets in this category.

For each respective second month for the fourth category (Appendix H), each respective third month (see Appendix L) and overall (Appendix P) the NFL was the top Tweeter, followed by the AFL, the NCAA and then the Australian minor leagues.

Total Tweets

Overall for each month, all categories combined (see Appendix Q) The NFL had the most Tweets, with a total of 27, 169. Within this, month one (November) had the most Tweets, followed by month two (December) and then month three (January). The AFL was the league whom had the second largest amount of Tweets, with month two (August) having the largest number, followed by the third month (September) and finally month one (July). The NCAA had the third largest amount of Tweets; the second month (October) was the top, followed by the first (September) and finally, the third month (November). The Australian minor league had the least amount of Tweets; this was in the order of the third month (August) having most of the Tweets, followed by the second (July) and the first month (June).

Discussion

Overall, the USA professional league, being the NFL, utilized Twitter more frequently than the Australian professional league, being the AFL. The NFL also Tweeted more frequently than the USA amateur league – the NCAA. However, the NCAA utilized Twitter more than the Australian minor leagues. Finally, the AFL was more efficient in Twitter use than the Australian minor leagues. With this, results illustrate that the USA leagues have an overall stronger social media presence than Australian leagues.

It was hypothesized that the NFL and NCAA Football would utilize Twitter more effectively in comparison to both the AFL and the respective Australian minor leagues in all areas of analysis. In addition to this, comparing the NFL and NCAA football, it was predicted that NCAA football will Tweet more frequently, as would have the AFL in comparison to its minor leagues. Results illustrated that the NFL was the top Tweeter, however the NCAA did not Tweet more than the AFL. With these results, it can be suggested that when comparing the two top league professional leagues, the USA professional league, being the NFL, and the Australian league, being the AFL, that the USA professional sporting league is more effective in its social media use. However, it cannot be suggested that the USA leagues as a whole are more effective in comparison to Australian leagues, due to the AFL ranking higher than the NCAA Football league. In addition to this, results did illustrate that the USA amateur league (the NCAA) operated social media more effectively than the Australian minor leagues (the WAFL, SANFL and VFL).

In terms of teams and leagues promoting their sponsors and partners, the NFL was most effective and the Australian minor leagues the least. Results followed this same pattern for team promotion and other Tweets, in which seemed to be a category that sorted the interaction

between the given team and fans. However, in terms of addressing negative behavior, the AFL was the most effective in addressing these issues with the public through Twitter; the NCAA did not address any negative behavior issues.

Due to data only being collected over a three-month time span, a limitation is added to the research; the final three-months of each respective season is not enough time to develop a clear understanding and analysis of how each team utilizes the platform of social media. Therefore, our current analysis and understanding is minimal.

Another major limitation that occurred with our results and research, was that data missing for three different teams. In the AFL, data was missing for Port Adelaide from July 1st to July 4th. Two teams from the NFL had data missing: (1) Seattle Seahawks, from December 8th to December 16th and (2) the New England Patriots, from November 8th to November 12th.

It is suggested that future research involves the analysis of both the utilization of social media, in direct comparison to the amount of donations provided by sponsors and partners in addition to the number of social media followers/subscribers.

Conclusion

Social media is extremely prevalent in today's society; it has such mammoth potential in terms of impact on engagement with stakeholders; whether those stakeholders are fans, customers, partners or investors, social media will benefit each and every user in a different manner. This could range from engagement to allow fans to feel apart of the team to promotion and expose for businesses. Teams that lack this means of communication and promotion are missing out on a huge amount of potential income; from fans investing in

merchandise to large corporation sponsorship. With the usage of Twitter being quantified, teams are able to see where improvement is needed in order to be at the same level of communication as fellow teams in the sporting industry.

The originality of the research came from the vast range of examination. This research took multiple angles, allowing for the results to be utilised at multiple levels. The three different comparisons of country to country, league to league and professional to amateur, allowed a comparison of utilization for the teams and leagues.

As McCarthy (2014) illustrated, enhanced interaction is one benefit that stems from an organizations use of social media. This enriched interaction can be seen with the teams analyzed and their fans; teams were able to respond to fan concerns or comments in a direct and timely manner. Teams did not utilize Twitter to address negative issues surround the respective team and their players. The 55% increase in fan passion, in which was determined by Broughton in 2010, through the linkage with Facebook and Twitter shows the importance of utilizing social media by the teams and leagues.

Overall, the results revealed that the more popular leagues and its' given teams utilize social media than the less popular leagues. When ranking the usage of social media, country versus country, the USA is more efficient than Australia. However, each team lacked sufficient information being presented via social media addressing negative issues. Results also illustrated that sponsor/partner promotion by each respective team was deficient.

These results found will not only assist the Sport Management industry, but other industries that, too, rely on social media to connect with their stakeholders. From business to marketing and design, the potential utilization of social media is just as prevalent and

important; resulting in the findings having the ability to reach all industries on a world-wide basis. Sport is a huge money making industry in many countries and so any advantage leagues and teams can have over one another is vital. In this technology-focused world, this concept can be applied to all industries. Stakeholders and teams that once were locally based, are now spread across the world due to the connectivity that social media brings.

Appendices

Appendix: A

TEAM	Month One: Category 1			
	Sponsor/Partner Promotion			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	14	5	0	19
Geelong	12	7	0	19
Fremantle	0	1	0	1
Sydney Swans	0	0	0	0
Richmond	1	2	0	3
Collingwood	0	0	0	0
Port Adelaide	0	2	0	2
Carlton	3	0	1	4
Essendon	0	0	1	1
North Melbourne	1	0	0	1
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	31	17	2	50
West Perth	0	0	0	0
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Box Hill Hawks	0	0	0	0
Geelong Cats VFL	0	0	0	0
WAFL/SNAFL/VFLLEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	0	0
Seattle	4	38	1	43
Denver	0	0	0	0
New England	0	10	0	10
San Francisco	0	2	1	3
Carolina	0	0	1	1
Indianapolis	0	12	1	13
New Orleans	1	2	0	3
San Diego	0	4	0	4
Kansas	0	4	0	4
Cincinnati	5	10	1	16
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	10	82	5	97
Florida State	0	0	0	0
Auburn	0	0	0	0
Michigan State	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	1	1
Oklahoma	1	0	0	1
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	1	0	1	2

Appendix: B

TEAM	Month One: Category 2			
	Team Promotion			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	396	0	34	430
Geelong	466	9	83	558
Fremantle	375	0	18	393
Sydney Swans	301	2	13	316
Richmond	229	8	19	256
Collingwood	572	0	23	595
Port Adelaide	505	19	64	588
Carlton	401	13	40	454
Essendon	600	4	6	610
North Melbourne	421	3	35	459
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	4266	58	335	4659
West Perth	176	7	8	191
East Perth	51	21	6	78
Norwood	46	3	2	51
North Adelaide	1	3	0	4
Box Hill Hawks	198	6	7	211
Geelong Cats VFL	247	50	26	323
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	719	90	49	858
Seattle	1051	110	327	1488
Denver	608	12	95	715
New England	347	26	18	391
San Francisco	758	8	17	783
Carolina	365	29	102	496
Indianapolis	630	24	249	903
New Orleans	488	7	140	635
San Diego	562	9	59	630
Kansas	611	16	167	794
Cincinnati	278	8	27	313
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	5698	249	1201	7148
Florida State	368	53	37	458
Auburn	115	25	7	147
Michigan State	436	48	32	516
South Carolina	179	33	19	231
Missouri	463	33	48	544
Oklahoma	996	48	51	1095
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	2557	240	194	2991

Appendix: C

TEAM	Month One: Category 3			
	Negative Behavior			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	16	9	0	25
Geelong	1	0	0	1
Fremantle	0	0	0	0
Sydney Swans	0	0	0	0
Richmond	0	11	0	11
Collingwood	0	0	0	0
Port Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Carlton	0	0	0	0
Essendon	2	0	0	2
North Melbourne	38	0	1	39
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	57	20	1	78
West Perth	0	0	0	0
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Box Hill Hawks	0	0	0	0
Geelong Cats VFL	0	0	0	0
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	0	0
Seattle	0	0	0	0
Denver	0	0	0	0
New England	0	0	0	0
San Francisco	0	0	0	0
Carolina	0	0	0	0
Indianapolis	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	0	0	0	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0
Cincinnati	0	0	0	0
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	0	0
Florida State	0	0	0	0
Auburn	0	0	0	0
Michigan State	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	0	0

Appendix: D

TEAM	Month One: Category 4			
	Other			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	12	0	0	12
Geelong	47	3	2	52
Fremantle	28	0	0	28
Sydney Swans	14	1	0	15
Richmond	75	0	0	75
Collingwood	104	0	1	105
Port Adelaide	17	5	8	30
Carlton	45	5	2	52
Essendon	178	4	0	182
North Melbourne	113	0	5	118
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	633	18	18	669
West Perth	1	0	0	1
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	1	1
North Adelaide	1	0	0	1
Box Hill Hawks	10	0	0	10
Geelong Cats VFL	8	0	0	8
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	20	0	1	21
Seattle	215	0	5	220
Denver	1	0	1	2
New England	2890	1	5	2896
San Francisco	1	0	8	9
Carolina	160	2	1	163
Indianapolis	218	0	0	218
New Orleans	151	0	4	155
San Diego	272	0	0	272
Kansas	36	0	10	46
Cincinnati	2	0	0	2
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	3946	3	34	3983
Florida State	0	0	0	0
Auburn	0	0	1	1
Michigan State	7	12	10	29
South Carolina	0	0	3	3
Missouri	0	0	1	1
Oklahoma	39	0	0	39
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	46	12	15	73

Appendix: E

TEAM	Month Two: Category 1			
	Sponsor/Partner Promotion			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	7	0	0	7
Geelong	2	4	1	7
Fremantle	0	0	0	0
Sydney Swans	0	0	0	0
Richmond	0	0	0	0
Collingwood	0	1	0	1
Port Adelaide	1	7	0	8
Carlton	1	6	0	7
Essendon	1	0	0	1
North Melbourne	8	3	0	11
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	20	21	1	42
West Perth	0	0	0	0
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Box Hill Hawks	0	0	1	1
Geelong Cats VFL	0	0	0	0
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	1	1
Seattle	1	12	1	14
Denver	0	1	0	1
New England	5	5	0	10
San Francisco	1	4	2	7
Carolina	2	4	0	6
Indianapolis	4	7	0	11
New Orleans	0	4	0	4
San Diego	0	3	0	3
Kansas	7	4	0	11
Cincinnati	2	3	0	5
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	22	47	3	72
Florida State	0	0	0	0
Auburn	0	0	0	0
Michigan State	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	1	1
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	1	1

Appendix: F

TEAM	Month Two: Category 2			
	Team Promotion			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	593	0	53	646
Geelong	641	16	109	766
Fremantle	284	3	13	300
Sydney Swans	467	1	40	508
Richmond	576	16	51	643
Collingwood	649	0	33	682
Port Adelaide	817	9	95	921
Carlton	408	17	73	498
Essendon	844	7	15	866
North Melbourne	931	5	61	997
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	6210	74	543	6827
West Perth	109	6	16	131
East Perth	71	21	16	108
Norwood	33	6	5	44
North Adelaide	0	5	12	17
Box Hill Hawks	238	7	12	257
Geelong Cats VFL	228	54	23	305
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	679	99	84	862
Seattle	785	73	331	1189
Denver	674	9	103	786
New England	378	28	40	446
San Francisco	557	7	4	568
Carolina	726	53	172	951
Indianapolis	579	25	215	819
New Orleans	511	15	161	687
San Diego	658	18	48	724
Kansas	510	6	148	664
Cincinnati	321	15	28	364
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	5699	249	1250	7198
Florida State	437	67	159	663
Auburn	154	31	15	200
Michigan State	662	75	30	767
South Carolina	131	27	20	178
Missouri	294	28	39	361
Oklahoma	821	48	17	886
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	2499	276	280	3055

Appendix: G

TEAM	Month Two: Category 3			
	Negative Behavior			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	2	0	0	2
Geelong	0	0	0	0
Fremantle	13	0	0	13
Sydney Swans	0	0	0	0
Richmond	0	0	0	0
Collingwood	0	0	0	0
Port Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Carlton	1	0	0	1
Essendon	0	0	0	0
North Melbourne	10	0	1	11
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	26	0	1	27
West Perth	0	0	0	0
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	0	2	0	2
Box Hill Hawks	0	0	0	0
Geelong Cats VFL	0	0	0	0
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	2	0	2
Seattle	0	0	0	0
Denver	0	0	0	0
New England	0	0	0	0
San Francisco	0	0	0	0
Carolina	0	0	0	0
Indianapolis	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	0	0	0	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0
Kansas	1	0	0	1
Cincinnati	0	0	0	0
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	1	0	0	1
Florida State	0	0	0	0
Auburn	0	0	0	0
Michigan State	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	0	0

Appendix: H

TEAM	Month Two: Category 4			
	Other			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	13	3	0	16
Geelong	65	16	2	83
Fremantle	20	1	0	21
Sydney Swans	28	0	1	29
Richmond	246	22	0	268
Collingwood	223	2	0	225
Port Adelaide	65	7	1	73
Carlton	38	9	0	47
Essendon	39	3	0	42
North Melbourne	212	0	21	233
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	949	63	25	1037
West Perth	2	0	3	5
East Perth	1	1	0	2
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	1	0	0	1
Box Hill Hawks	8	0	0	8
Geelong Cats VFL	8	1	0	9
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	20	2	3	25
Seattle	180	2	4	186
Denver	1	2	1	4
New England	66	0	0	66
San Francisco	5	0	0	5
Carolina	159	0	9	168
Indianapolis	409	0	2	411
New Orleans	140	0	13	153
San Diego	159	1	0	160
Kansas	56	0	0	56
Cincinnati	1	0	0	1
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	1176	5	29	1210
Florida State	0	0	3	3
Auburn	0	3	0	3
Michigan State	0	13	0	13
South Carolina	0	0	1	1
Missouri	1	4	1	
Oklahoma	37	3	1	41
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	38	23	6	67

Appendix: I

TEAM	Month Three: Category 1			
	Sponsor/Partner Promotion			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	0	0	0	0
Geelong	1	2	0	3
Fremantle	0	0	0	0
Sydney Swans	0	0	0	0
Richmond	5	0	0	5
Collingwood	4	0	0	4
Port Adelaide	6	2	0	8
Carlton	0	0	0	0
Essendon	0	1	0	1
North Melbourne	2	0	0	2
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	18	5	0	23
West Perth	0	0	0	0
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Box Hill Hawks	0	0	0	0
Geelong Cats VFL	0	0	0	0
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	0	0
Seattle	5	6	0	11
Denver	0	2	1	3
New England	8	6	0	14
San Francisco	0	4	0	4
Carolina	1	3	0	4
Indianapolis	0	3	0	3
New Orleans	0	0	0	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0
Kansas	0	8	0	8
Cincinnati	0	2	0	2
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	14	34	1	49
Florida State	2	1	0	3
Auburn	0	0	0	0
Michigan State	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	1	0	1
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	2	2	0	4

Appendix: J

TEAM	Month Three: Category 2			
	Team Promotion			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	555	4	191	750
Geelong	377	17	62	456
Fremantle	250	6	11	267
Sydney Swans	452	3	51	506
Richmond	271	5	37	313
Collingwood	188	0	5	193
Port Adelaide	932	12	119	1063
Carlton	112	1	12	125
Essendon	339	8	14	361
North Melbourne	546	7	93	646
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	4022	63	595	4680
West Perth	170	2	2	174
East Perth	64	26	8	98
Norwood	51	6	6	63
North Adelaide	1	1	1	3
Box Hill Hawks	290	15	12	317
Geelong Cats VFL	290	47	35	372
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	866	97	64	1027
Seattle	1050	118	464	1632
Denver	390	20	65	475
New England	902	50	106	1058
San Francisco	171	4	6	181
Carolina	497	34	145	676
Indianapolis	494	46	272	812
New Orleans	156	9	50	215
San Diego	162	11	26	199
Kansas	184	12	90	286
Cincinnati	91	5	8	104
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	4097	309	1232	5638
Florida State	369	58	53	480
Auburn	242	92	60	394
Michigan State	488	45	30	563
South Carolina	183	25	12	220
Missouri	385	25	24	434
Oklahoma	756	47	37	840
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	2423	292	216	2931

Appendix: K

TEAM	Month Three: Category 3			
	Negative Behavior			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	0	0	0	0
Geelong	0	0	0	0
Fremantle	0	0	0	0
Sydney Swans	0	0	0	0
Richmond	0	0	0	0
Collingwood	0	0	0	0
Port Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Carlton	0	0	0	0
Essendon	1	0	0	1
North Melbourne	0	0	0	0
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	1	0	0	1
West Perth	0	0	0	0
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	0	2	2	4
Box Hill Hawks	0	0	0	0
Geelong Cats VFL	0	0	0	0
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	2	2	4
Seattle	0	0	0	0
Denver	0	0	0	0
New England	1	1	0	2
San Francisco	0	0	0	0
Carolina	0	0	0	0
Indianapolis	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	0	0	0	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0
Kansas	1	0	0	1
Cincinnati	0	0	0	0
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	2	1	0	3
Florida State	0	0	0	0
Auburn	0	0	0	0
Michigan State	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	0	0

Appendix: L

TEAM	Month Three: Category 4			
	Other			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	81	0	5	86
Geelong	36	3	2	41
Fremantle	16	0	0	16
Sydney Swans	54	2	2	58
Richmond	182	1	0	183
Collingwood	67	0	1	68
Port Adelaide	156	25	2	183
Carlton	12	0	0	12
Essendon	71	0	0	71
North Melbourne	238	1	2	241
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	913	0	14	927
West Perth	0	0	1	1
East Perth	0	7	2	9
Norwood	0	1	7	8
North Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Box Hill Hawks	9	0	0	9
Geelong Cats VFL	9	0	1	10
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	18	8	11	37
Seattle	565	2	0	567
Denver	2	2	0	4
New England	79	1	2	82
San Francisco	0	0	1	1
Carolina	203	1	0	204
Indianapolis	557	0	0	557
New Orleans	60	0	13	73
San Diego	275	0	0	275
Kansas	6	1	0	7
Cincinnati	0	0	0	0
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	1747	7	16	1770
Florida State	0	0	5	5
Auburn	0	0	4	4
Michigan State	1	5	5	11
South Carolina	0	0	1	1
Missouri	2	0	1	3
Oklahoma	54	0	0	54
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	57	5	16	78

Appendix: M

TEAM	Total: Category 1			
	Sponsor/Partner Promotion			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	21	5	0	26
Geelong	15	13	1	29
Fremantle	0	1	0	1
Sydney Swans	0	0	0	0
Richmond	6	2	0	8
Collingwood	4	1	0	5
Port Adelaide	7	11	0	18
Carlton	4	6	1	11
Essendon	1	1	1	3
North Melbourne	11	3	0	14
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	69	43	3	115
West Perth	0	0	0	0
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Box Hill Hawks	0	0	1	1
Geelong Cats VFL	0	0	0	0
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	1	1
Seattle	10	56	2	68
Denver	0	3	1	4
New England	13	21	0	34
San Francisco	1	10	3	14
Carolina	3	7	1	11
Indianapolis	4	22	1	27
New Orleans	1	6	0	7
San Diego	0	7	0	7
Kansas	7	16	0	23
Cincinnati	7	15	1	23
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	46	163	9	218
Florida State	2	1	0	3
Auburn	0	0	0	0
Michigan State	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	1	0	1
Missouri	0	0	2	2
Oklahoma	1	0	0	1
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	3	2	2	7

Appendix: N

TEAM	Total: Category 2			
	Team Promotion			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	1544	4	278	1826
Geelong	1484	42	254	1780
Fremantle	909	9	42	960
Sydney Swans	1220	6	104	1330
Richmond	1076	29	107	1212
Collingwood	1409	0	61	1470
Port Adelaide	2254	40	278	2572
Carlton	921	31	125	1077
Essendon	1783	19	35	1837
North Melbourne	1898	15	189	2102
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	14498	195	1473	16166
West Perth	455	15	26	496
East Perth	186	68	30	284
Norwood	130	15	13	158
North Adelaide	2	9	13	24
Box Hill Hawks	726	28	31	785
Geelong Cats VFL	765	151	84	1000
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	2264	286	197	2747
Seattle	2886	301	1122	4309
Denver	1672	41	263	1976
New England	1627	104	164	1895
San Francisco	1486	19	27	1532
Carolina	1588	116	419	2123
Indianapolis	1703	95	736	2534
New Orleans	1155	31	351	1537
San Diego	1382	38	133	1553
Kansas	1305	34	405	1744
Cincinnati	690	28	63	781
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	15494	807	3683	19984
Florida State	1174	178	249	1601
Auburn	511	148	82	741
Michigan State	1586	168	92	1846
South Carolina	493	85	51	629
Missouri	1142	86	111	1339
Oklahoma	2573	143	105	2821
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	7479	808	690	8977

Appendix: O

TEAM	Total: Category 3			
	Negative Behavior			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	18	9	0	27
Geelong	1	0	0	1
Fremantle	13	0	0	13
Sydney Swans	0	0	0	0
Richmond	0	11	0	11
Collingwood	0	0	0	0
Port Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Carlton	1	0	0	1
Essendon	3	0	0	3
North Melbourne	48	0	2	50
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	84	20	2	106
West Perth	0	0	0	0
East Perth	0	0	0	0
Norwood	0	0	0	0
North Adelaide	0	4	2	6
Box Hill Hawks	0	0	0	0
Geelong Cats VFL	0	0	0	0
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	4	2	6
Seattle	0	0	0	0
Denver	0	0	0	0
New England	1	1	0	2
San Francisco	0	0	0	0
Carolina	0	0	0	0
Indianapolis	0	0	0	0
New Orleans	0	0	0	0
San Diego	0	0	0	0
Kansas	2	0	0	2
Cincinnati	0	0	0	0
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	3	1	0	4
Florida State	0	0	0	0
Auburn	0	0	0	0
Michigan State	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	0	0	0	0

Appendix: P

TEAM	Total: Category 4			
	Other			
	Team	Sponsor/Partner	Fan/Other	TOTAL
Hawthorn	106	3	5	114
Geelong	148	22	6	176
Fremantle	64	1	0	65
Sydney Swans	96	3	3	102
Richmond	503	23	0	526
Collingwood	394	2	2	398
Port Adelaide	238	37	11	286
Carlton	95	14	2	111
Essendon	288	7	0	295
North Melbourne	563	1	28	592
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	2495	81	57	2633
West Perth	3	0	4	7
East Perth	1	8	2	11
Norwood	0	1	8	9
North Adelaide	2	0	0	2
Box Hill Hawks	27	0	0	27
Geelong Cats VFL	25	1	1	27
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	58	10	15	83
Seattle	960	4	9	973
Denver	4	4	2	10
New England	3035	2	7	3044
San Francisco	6	0	9	15
Carolina	522	3	10	535
Indianapolis	1184	0	2	1186
New Orleans	351	0	30	381
San Diego	706	1	0	707
Kansas	98	1	10	109
Cincinnati	3	0	0	3
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	6869	15	79	6963
Florida State	0	0	8	8
Auburn	0	3	5	8
Michigan State	8	30	15	53
South Carolina	0	0	5	5
Missouri	3	4	3	10
Oklahoma	130	3	1	134
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	141	40	37	218

Appendix: Q

TEAM	TWEET TOTALS Month 1	TWEET TOTALS Month 2	TWEET TOTALS Month 3	OVERALL TWEET TOTALS
Hawthorn	486	671	836	1993
Geelong	630	856	500	1986
Fremantle	422	334	283	1039
Sydney Swans	331	537	564	1432
Richmond	345	911	501	1757
Collingwood	700	908	265	1873
Port Adelaide	620	1002	1254	2876
Carlton	510	553	137	1200
Essendon	795	909	434	2138
North Melbourne	617	1252	889	2758
AFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	5456	7933	5631	18343
West Perth	192	136	175	503
East Perth	78	110	107	295
Norwood	52	44	71	167
North Adelaide	5	20	7	32
Box Hill Hawks	221	266	326	813
Geelong Cats VFL	331	314	382	1027
WAFL/SANFL/VFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	879	890	1068	2837
Seattle	1751	1389	2210	5350
Denver	717	791	482	1990
New England	3297	522	1156	4975
San Francisco	795	580	186	1561
Carolina	660	1125	884	2669
Indianapolis	1134	1241	1372	3747
New Orleans	793	844	288	1925
San Diego	906	887	474	2267
Kansas	844	732	302	1878
Cincinnati	331	370	106	807
NFL LEAGUE TOTALS:	11228	8481	7460	27169
Florida State	458	666	488	1612
Auburn	148	203	398	749
Michigan State	545	780	574	1899
South Carolina	234	179	222	635
Missouri	546	362	437	1351
Oklahoma	1135	927	894	2956
NCAA LEAGUE TOTALS:	3066	3123	3013	9202

References

- Abreza, G., O'Reilly, N., & Reid, I. (2013). Relationship marketing and social media in sport. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 6, 120-142.
- Broughton, D. (2010, July 26). Survey: Social-media use builds fan avidity. *Sports Business Journal*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2010/07/20100726/This-Weeks-News/Survey-Social-Media-Use-Builds-Fan-Avidity.aspx>
- Broughton, D. (2011, June 27). Survey spots social media trends among fans. *Sports Business Journal*, p. 9.
- Filo, K., Lock, D., & Karg, A. (2015). Sport and social media research: A review. *Sport Management Review*, 18, 166-181.
- Fisher, E. (2012, May 7). Research shows social media moves tickets. *Sports Business Journal*, p.4.
- Hopkins, J. L. (2013). Engaging Australian Rules Football fans with social media: A case study. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 13, 104-121.

- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2009). Consumer Use and Business Potential of Virtual Worlds: The Case of "Second Life". *International Journal on Media Management*, 11:3-4, 93-101.
- McCarthy, B. (2014). A Sports Journalism of Their Own: An Investigation Into the Motivations, Behaviours, and Media Attitudes of Fan Sports Bloggers. *Communication & Sport*, 2, 65-79.
- Moyer, C., Pokrwczynski, J., & Griffith, R. J. (2015). The Relationship of Fans' Sports-Team Identification and Facebook Usage to Purchase of Team Products. *Journal of Sports Media*, 10(1), 31-49.
- Pedersen, P., Parks, J., Quarterman, J., & Thhibault, L. (2010). *Contemporary sport management*
- Pfahl, M., Kreutzer, A., Maleski, M., Lillibridge, J., & Ryznar, J. (2012). If you build it, will they come? A case study of digital spaces and brand in the National Basketball Association. *Sport Management Review*, 15, 518-537.
- Rothschild, P. C. (2011). Social media use in Sports and entertainment venues. *International Journal of Event Festival Management*, 2(2), 139-150.

Williams, J., & Chinn, S. J. (2010) Meeting relationship-marketing goals through social media: A conceptual model for sport marketers. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 3, 422-437.

Witkemper, C., Hoom Lim, C., & Waldburger, A. (2012). Social Media and Sports Marketing: Examining the Motivations and Constraints of Twitter Users. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 21, 170-183.