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Abstract

Competition for the sport consumer dollar has increased tremendously in recent years. A better understanding of why sport spectators and fans consume media and merchandise would benefit sport marketers and managers greatly. To date, no empirically tested model has proposed explanatory and predictive relationships among fan/spectator motives and behavior variables. In addition, no psychologically sound scales exist to measure these cognitive, affective, and behavioral constructs. The results of this study indicate that a model including such factors as motives, identification, expectancies, disconfirmation or confirmation of expectancies, affective state, and self-esteem behavioral intentions explains approximately 11% of the variance in sport spectator consumption intentions. The scales for the constructs evidenced good internal consistency and construct validity. The implications for sport marketers and managers are also described.

The results of this study indicate that a model including such factors as motives, identification, expectancies, disconfirmation or confirmation of expectancies, affective state, and self-esteem behavioral intentions explains approximately 11% of the variance in sport spectator consumption intentions.

Sport Spectator Consumption Behavior

In 1995, a conservative estimate showed the sport industry was worth approximately $152 billion and supported an additional $259 billion in economic activity, making it the eleventh-largest industry in the United States and comprising over 2% of the Gross Domestic Product (Meek, 1997). Sport spectators contributed greatly to these figures, a fact not lost upon marketers. That year, sport and fitness companies spent over $7.5 billion to promote their products and services (Meek, 1997).

The competition for the sport consumer dollar has increased tremendously in the last decade. In 1999, the sport industry was worth approximately $213 billion, and it spent over $31 billion on marketing and promotions (The Answer, 1999). A better understanding of why sport spectators and fans consume media and merchandise would benefit sport marketers and managers greatly. Based on extensive review of previous literature, Trail, Anderson, and Fink (2000) presented a theoretical model that proposed explanatory and predictive relationships among fan/spectator motive and behavior variables. This study empirically tests that model.

Model Overview

Trail et al. (2000) proposed that future sport spectator consumption behavior could be predicted by the interaction of six general factors: motives, level of identification, expectancies, confirmation or disconfirmation of expectancies, self-esteem responses, and the affective state of the individual. They hypothesized that each factor functioned sequentially. Each had either a direct or indirect effect on the factors that followed in the model.

For example, the motivation of an individual was hypothesized to directly influence his/her expectancies for the event. In addition, motivation could also influence individual expectancies for the event indirectly through identification with a team. Then, the individual's expectancies about the event experience itself, including the outcome of the event (winning or losing), would be either confirmed or disconfirmed by the individual's perception of the experience. Based upon the degree of confirmation or disconfirmation of expectancies, it was hypothesized that the highly identified individual would respond with self-esteem maintenance/building behavior, such as basking in reflected glory (BIRGing; Cialdini, Borden, Thorne, Walker, Freeman, & Sloan, 1976) or cutting off reflected failure (CORFing; Snyder, Lasigard, & Ford, 1986).

In turn, self-esteem building/maintenance behavior would influence the individual's affective state. However, for indi-
Description of the Model's Components

This section provides a brief analysis of the model's components and supporting evidence for the hypothesized relationships. For a more thorough description, please see Trail et al. (2000).

Motives

People consume sport for different reasons. Individuals possess various motives for attending a game, buying team merchandise, watching a game on television, etc. Based upon an extensive literature review, Trail et al. (2000) proposed that nine different motives explain why individuals consume sport or are sport fans. Most of these motives are based on social and psychological needs: vicarious achievement, acquisition of knowledge, aesthetics, social interaction, drama/excitement, escape (relation), family, physical attractiveness of participants, and quality of physical skill of the participants. Trail et al. (2000) suggested that spectators attend games due to one, or a combination, of these motives.

Substantial evidence supports the idea that most of the above sport spectator motives are correlated (Trail & James, 2001; Madrigal & Howard, 1999; Wann, 1995). Because the motives are correlated to varying degrees, Trail et al. (2000) hypothesized that the nine factors (first order latent variables) would comprise a second order latent variable labeled “motives.” Additionally, Trail and James have shown that all of these motives are significantly correlated with team identification (range: $r = .23$ to .71), except for physical attractiveness of participants ($r = .13$). Wann also reported significant correlations between his eight motivation subscales and team identification (range: $r = .14$ to $r = .71$).

Thus, as the model indicates, Trail et al. (2000) hypothesized that latent variable motive is related to identification with the team. Further, different motives would also lead to different expectations regarding the game. For example, an individual high in the family motive may have very different expectations regarding the game experience than those who are motivated by the physical skill of the participants. A person high in the family motive would be satisfied with the experience as long as it offered a pleasant environment in which to interact with family members, while a person motivated by the physical skill of the participants would be focused on the play of the athletes. Therefore, Trail et al. (2000) hypothesized that this latent variable would influence the indi-
While individual motives did predict some expectations for event outcomes (approximately 16%), expectations for event outcomes did not predict disconfirmation of expectancies.

Identification

Identification has been defined as "an orientation of the self in regard to other objects, including a person or group, that results in feelings or sentiments of close attachment" (Trail et al., 2000, pp. 165-166). This is an important concept within consumer behavior, especially with regard to leisure and sport consumption. Identification has been shown to be associated with cognition, affect, and behavior. For example, Wann and Branscombe (1993) showed that expectations for future performance (cognition) differed by team identification level. Those higher in team identification expected the team to perform at a higher level than those with lower levels of identification. In addition, Wann and Dolan (1994) and Wann (1994) found that highly identified individuals differed from those less identified in their beliefs about the future success or failure of the team. Madrigal (1995) and Wann and Schrader (1997) found that the level of team identification influenced the level of enjoyment (affect) that individuals experienced.

Several authors (Mitaro, 1999; Sutton, McDonald, Milne, Cimperman, 1997) noted relationships between identification and fan behavior. More specifically, a fair amount of evidence indicates that identification is highly correlated with basking-in-reflected-glory (BIRGing) behavior (discussed later) (Madrigal, 1995; Sloan, 1989), attending more games, and paying more for tickets (Wann & Branscombe, 1993). Based upon this information, Trail et al. (2000) hypothesized that identification would influence expectancies about the event and, indirectly, other affective, cognitive, and behavior variables.

Expectancies and Disconfirmation

Zillmann, Bryant, and Sapolsky (1989) and Goldstein (1989) both suggested that fans and spectators have specific expectations going into events. These expectancies may be about the outcome of the game, the style of play, the competitiveness of the teams, or their own level of enjoyment. Trail et al. (2000) noted that few empirical studies on expectancies about events exist. Pan, Gabert, McGaugh, and Bravold (1997), however, determined that overall outlook for the season was the highest-loading item on their "Team Success" variable. This variable explained 12% of the variance in purchasing season tickets. Wann (1996) also found that expectancies about the quality of the opponent influenced attendance at future games.

Therefore, Trail et al. (2000) hypothesized that event expectancies would influence sport consumption behavior. A person's expectations regarding the team's or an athlete's performance would, in turn, affect their appraisal of the game upon completion. However, as the model indicates, the confirmation or disconfirmation of these expectancies will mediate this relationship.

Expectancies about the event can be either confirmed or disconfirmed. If an individual expects the team to win and it does, the expectancy is positively confirmed. Madrigal (1995) suggested that expectancies could also be either positively or negatively disconfirmed (e.g., the team wins when expected to lose, positive disconfirmation, or the team loses when expected to win, negative disconfirmation).

Madrigal conceptualized a continuum with negative disconfirmation on one end, followed by negative confirmation, then positive confirmation, and anchored on the other end by positive disconfirmation. He noted that the reaction of the individual would be more acute when the expectation is disconfirmed, whether negatively or positively. For example, if a spectator expected the team to lose and the team won, the spectator would experience more enjoyment than if expecting the team to win. Thus, Trail et al. suggested that expectancy disconfirmation would influence the affective state of the individual directly.

Self-Esteem Maintenance Behaviors

Additionally, Trail et al. (2000) hypothesized that expectancy disconfirmation would influence the affective state of the individual indirectly through self-esteem maintenance behaviors. They suggested that both basking in reflected glory (BIRGing) and cutting off reflected failure (CORFing) comprise self-esteem responses.

The former allows people to build self-esteem through the association of successful others, whereas the latter allows individuals to maintain existing levels of self-esteem by distancing themselves from unsuccessful others (Wann & Branscombe, 1990). Thus, logically, individuals would experience greater enjoyment if they were able to BIRG.

Lending empirical evidence to this thought, Madrigal (1995) found that the path coefficient between expectancy disconfirmation and BIRGing behavior was .24 and the coefficient with enjoyment was .39, thus explaining approximately 6% and 15% of the variance in each dependent variable respectively. That is, those individuals who experienced positive disconfirmation had higher levels of BIRGing behavior and higher levels of enjoyment. Indeed, it seems logical that when fans are able to celebrate after a big
win, discuss the important plays, and rehash the big moments in the
game, they will have a more enjoyable game experience.

Affective Reactions and Future Consumption Behaviors

Trail et al. (2002) suggested that the affective state is comprised of
enjoyment and satisfaction, variables shown by Madrigal (1995)
and Wann, Dolan, McGeorge, and Allison (1994) to be significantly
correlated. In addition, Wann et al. found that the event outcome had
an effect on the enjoyment levels of the individual.

No researcher has explicitly
tested the assumption that affective
state has an influence on intentions
of sport consumption. However,
Laverie and Arnett (2000) showed
that a path coefficient from satisfaction
to previous sport behavior had
a significant (though small) value (β
= .15). Trail et al. hypothesized
that affective state, influenced by all
of the previously mentioned vari-
ables in the model, has an impact
on intentions for sport consumption
behavior (e.g., intention to attend,
i ntention to purchase merchandise,
i ntention to support the team). That
is, the better one feels at the end of
the contest, the more likely one is
to engage in future fan behavior.

Although the model was derived
from a review of previous research,
Trail et al. (2002) did not empiri-
cally test the model; thus, no statis-
tical evidence exists which indicates
that these five factors
(motives, level of identification, expectancies, confirmation/discon-
firmation, self-esteem responses)

Table 1
Factor Loadings (B), Confidence Intervals (CI), Standard Errors (SE), t-values, and Average Variance Explained
Values (AVE) for the Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor and Item</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a personal sense of achievement when the team does well</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.794–.864</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>39.16</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I have won when the team wins</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.875–.931</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>53.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel proud when the team plays well</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.745–.824</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate the beauty inherent in the game of basketball</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.862–.915</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>55.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the natural beauty in the game of basketball</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.899–.946</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>64.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the gracefulness associated with the game of basketball</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.733–.812</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the drama of close games</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.732–.828</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer watching a close game rather than a one-sided game</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.709–.809</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy it when the outcome is not decided until the very end</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.758–.851</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>28.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The game provides an escape for me from my day-to-day routine</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.789–.871</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>33.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the game is a change of pace from what I regularly do</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.600–.714</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The game provides a diversion from “life’s little problems” for me</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.827–.905</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I increase my knowledge about basketball at the game</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.846–.899</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>54.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I increase my understanding of basketball strategy by watching the game</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.867–.916</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>60.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn about the technical aspects of basketball by watching the game</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.882–.928</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>65.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The athletic skills of the players are something I appreciate</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.826–.883</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>49.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy watching a well-executed athletic performance</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.881–.927</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>64.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy a skillful performance by the team</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.865–.914</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>59.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy interacting with other spectators at the game</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.838–.889</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>55.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy talking with others at the game</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.896–.935</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>76.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy socializing with people sitting near me at the game</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.923–.957</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>90.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The game provides an opportunity for me to spend time with my family</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.849–.942</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The game provides an opportunity for me to spend time with my spouse</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.603–.720</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The game provides an opportunity for me to spend time with my children</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.722–.824</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have a significant effect on affect and, subsequently, sport consumption behavior intentions. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to test Trail et al.'s proposed model with a sample of spectators attending intercollegiate basketball games. A secondary purpose of this study was to create and/or test the construct validity and reliability of the scales that measured the aforementioned constructs.

### Method

#### Demographics

Data were collected from spectators at two (one men’s, n = 168, and one women’s, n = 196) intercollegiate basketball games at an NCAA Division I-A university. Out of 500 questionnaires distributed, 364 usable questionnaires were returned for a return rate of 72.8%. Of the total sample, 53.8% of respondents were female and 46.2% were male.

At the men’s games, 61.2% of respondents were male, 58.8% were female. And at the women’s games, 65.7% of respondents were female, and 34.3% were male.

A majority of all respondents were Caucasian (85.2%). Hispanics represented 5.5% of the respondents, African-Americans 3.8%, Asians 1.1%, Native Americans .3%, and 1.7% selected “other.” In addition, 2.5% did not respond to the item regarding their race/ethnic-

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor and Item</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification with team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be a “real” fan of the basketball team</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.792-.863</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would experience a loss if I had to stop being a fan of the team</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.749-.829</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a fan of the basketball team is very important to me</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.875-.933</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>51.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect the (team name) to play well today</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.879-.923</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>68.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect today’s game to be well played</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.894-.935</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>74.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect the (team name) to win today</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.876-.920</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>67.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy Disconfirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the (team name) offensive performance</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.425-.558</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the (team name) defensive performance</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.748-.819</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>35.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The (team name) overall quality of play</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.971-.1.00</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of play by both teams</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.744-.816</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>35.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The result of the game</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.694-.777</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel happy</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.898-.933</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>85.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feelcheerful</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.890-.927</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>80.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel delighted</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.885-.924</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>77.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel disappointed</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.766-.838</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel upset</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.824-.883</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel irritated</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.810-.873</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.054-.231</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the outcome</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.823-.886</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>44.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the performance of the team</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.773-.845</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>36.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRGing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to increase my association with this team</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.627-.737</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to publicize my connection with this team</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.696-.794</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>25.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to tell others about my association with this team</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.812-.891</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>35.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORFing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want to support this team any longer</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.586-.709</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not wish to be a fan of this team after today’s performance</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.756-.855</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to disconnect myself from this team</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.741-.841</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more likely to attend future games</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.475-.606</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more likely to purchase the team’s merchandise</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.836-.897</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>46.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more likely to buy (team name) clothing</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.874-.930</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>53.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more likely to support the (team name)</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.643-.743</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ity. For the total sample, the average age was 45.8 years (SD = 14.6).

**Instrumentation**

The questionnaire was comprised of seven scales. The Motivation Scale for Sport Consumption (MSSC) and the Team Identification Index (TII) have shown adequate psychometric properties in limited previous use (Trail & James, 2001). For this study, the MSSC was slightly modified to improve on previous inadequacies, and the physical attraction subscale was deleted at the athletic department's request. Thus, the MSSC consisted of 24 items (eight subscales, three items per subscale) with a 7-point response format ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to “Strongly Agree” (7).

The remaining scales were created specifically for this study. Four of the five other scales had the same response format as the MSSC and TII scales, however, the five item Disconfirmation of Expectancies Scale (DCES) had a 7-point response format ranging from "Much worse than I expected" (1) to "As expected" (4) and then to "Much better than expected" (7). The Expectancy for Event Outcome Scale (EOES) had three items, and the Intentions for Sport Consumption Behavior Scale (ISCBS) had four items. The Self-Esteem Maintenance Behavior Scale (SEMBS) was comprised of two, three-item subscales, BIRGing and CORFing. The Affective State Index (ASI) was comprised of three-three item subscales: positive mood, negative mood, and satisfaction.

**Data Analysis**

The RAMONA Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) technique, available in the SYSTAT 7.0 (1997) statistical package, was used to test the model depicted in Figure 1 and to test the factor loadings of the items on the specified factors. Construct validity measures (Average Variance Explained values, AVE) are indicated to show whether each item contributes to the scale's underlying theoretical construct. Values above .50 indicate that the scales have good convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

**Procedures**

The questionnaires were distributed prior to the game. At that time, respondents were asked to complete the scales measuring the motives, the identification with the team, and their expectancies for the event. After completion of these three scales, the respondents were asked to hold the questionnaire until the end of the game, and then complete the disconfirmation of expectancies, self-esteem behavior, affective state, and behavioral intention scales. The students collected the questionnaires as the respondents exited the building.

**Results**

The MSSC showed good construct validity and reliability (see Table 1). The reliability and construct validity values of the remaining eight scales/subscales are represented in Table 2. Because these scales and subscales had good internal consistency, construct validity, and adequate representation of the theorized constructs, we were confident in using them within the sport consumer behavioral model.

In addition, we tested whether the first order latent variables (the subscales) represented their designated second order constructs (the scales). All first order motive latent variables loaded significantly on the second order latent variable motive (Table 3), although the path coefficient of family was low (β = .129). The measurement model indicated that the first order latent variables adequately represented the second order latent variables for the affective state and self-esteem maintenance behavior scales as well (see Table 3).

The results of the structural equation modeling analysis showed that the model originally hypothesized

---

**Table 3**

Maximum Likelihood Point Estimates (b), Confidence Intervals (CI), Standard Errors (SE), t-values (t) for Original Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Order Factors on 2nd Order Factors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement ← Motives</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.800 - .882</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>33.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge ← Motives</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.511 - .647</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>14.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics ← Motives</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.633 - .746</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>20.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama ← Motives</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.355 - .508</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape ← Motives</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.535 - .674</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>14.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ← Motives</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.032 - .228</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Skills ← Motives</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.687 - .789</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ← Motives</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.570 - .693</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect ← Affective State</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.930 - .975</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>69.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect ← Affective State</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.845 - .887</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>41.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction ← Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.940 - .999</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>53.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRGing ← Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.616 - .761</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORFing ← Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.475</td>
<td>-.674 - -.276</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Coefficients Between Factors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motives → Identification</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.807 - .888</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>34.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives → Expectancies</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.262 - .550</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification → Expectancies</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.014 - .387</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancies → Disconfirmation of Expectancies</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.131 - -.050</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem → Affect</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.021 - .281</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem → Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.083 - .318</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconfirmation of Expectancies → Affect</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.496 - .632</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>13.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect → Future behavior</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.240 - .411</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by Trail et al. (2000), which included all of the manifest and latent variables, fit reasonably (RMSEA, \( \varepsilon = .056 \)). The confidence interval around the RMSEA point estimate was small (CI = .054, .059). The chi-square per degree of freedom value was acceptable (\( \chi^2/df = 2919/1356 = 2.15 \)), and only 15.6% residuals were greater than .1.

However, the path coefficient between the expectancies for the event outcome and the disconfirmation or confirmation of the expectancies was not significant, indicating that no relationship existed between these two variables (see Table 3). In addition, several path coefficients were very small, indicating that the amount of variance explained was negligible at best. For example, the path from identification to expectancies had a coefficient of .186, indicating that identification explained only 3.5% of the variance in event outcome expectancies. In addition, disconfirmation of event expectancies explained only 2.3% of the variance in the self-esteem response behaviors. Finally, the results of this study left 89.4% of the variance in future sport spectator consumption behavior unexplained by the variables in the model.

**Discussion**

The internal consistency and construct validity for all but one of the scales/subscales (satisfaction) was good, indicating that the measures of each of the constructs indeed represented the idea of that construct. In addition, the fit indices of the model were reasonable. However, the small amount of explained variance in intentions for future sport consumption behavior is a cause for concern. Because both the objective of the model proposed by Trail et al. (2000) and the primary purpose of this research were to incorporate extant variables that determine intentions for future consumption behavior, explaining only 10.6% of the variance in that variable was not satisfactory. Nevertheless, some aspects of the model did work well and should be incorporated into future research.

**Model Fit**

Trail et al. (2000) hypothesized that motives would be related to identification with the team. Motives explained 72% of the variance in identification lending support to that hypothesis and confirming previous findings (Trail & James, 2001; Wann, 1995). While individual motives did predict some expectations for event outcomes (approximately 16%), expectations preceding the disconfirmation variable.

From an empirical standpoint, one of the largest deficiencies in the model was the non-significance of the path coefficient between expectancies and the disconfirmation or confirmation of expectancies. Because this path coefficient was not significant, none of the variables that preceded expectancies had a significant relationship with any of the variables that were antecedent to that relationship. Consequently, neither motives nor identification with the team had any statistically significant relationship with the self-esteem responses or affective state.

Neither motives nor identification with the team had any statistically significant relationship with the self-esteem responses or affective state.
existed, because the disconfirmation scale took into account
epectancies by asking whether the
team performed better or worse
than expected. Thus, the study
confirmed the ideas of Peter,
Churchill, and Brown (1993), who
presented several reasons why pre-
situation and post-situation discrep-
ancy scores on expectations should
be avoided. Future research should
either eliminate the event/outcome
expectancies factor from the model
or modify the response formats so
they can work better.

Trail et al. (2000) hypothesized
that disconfirmation would lead
directly to affective state (Madrigal,
1995). This was supported by the
findings, as disconfirmation
explained approximately 32% of
the variance in affective state.
However, the Trail et al. model
denoted that self-esteem responses
would mediate the disconfirmation
affective-state relationship also.
This could be true if affective state
is an aftereffect of the resulting self-
estem behavior.

However, in the present model,
the path coefficients indicate that
disconfirmation explained 2% of
the variance in self-esteem behav-
ior, and self-esteem behavior
explained only 4% of the variance
in affective state. Future research
should examine if a more immedi-
ate outcome of disconfirmation
would be an initial affective
response. In essence, as the out-
come occurs, spectators’ expecta-
tions would be either confirmed or
disconfirmed, and they would feel
joy or sadness before engaging in
any self-esteem responses.

We also reexamined the item
wordings of all aforementioned
scales and found that the variables
in this area of the model were
incorrect in their temporal place-
ment. For example, in measuring
the self-esteem responses, we asked
if respondents would like to
increase their association with the
team or would like to disconnect
themselves from the team, which in
both cases was a prediction of
behavioral intention. In contrast,
the affective state scales asked how
the respondents felt at the time they
filled out the survey (immediately
after the game), a measure of their
affect at the present.

It seems much more logical to
suggest that present attitude (in this
instance, affect) precedes intended
self-esteem behavior, which also
supports the theoretical linkages.
Granted, this circumstance could
then turn into a reciprocal relation-
ship (i.e., the more the individual
BIRGs, the better the individual
feels; the better the individual feels,
the more the individual BIRGs), but
we hypothesize that the most logi-
ical, direct path would be discon-
firmation to feelings, of affective state.
Madrigal’s (1995) model showed a
non-directional relationship
between present level of enjoyment
and intentions for future BIRGing
behavior lending support to this
hypothesis. Future research should
test this theory.

In addition, O’Guinn and Faber
(1989) showed that a relationship
existed between self-esteem and
compulsive consumption. Thus,
based upon the reexamination of
the theoretical basis for the relation-
ships among the identified vari-
ables, as well as the non-significant
or low-path coefficients of the
model, we suggest that a new
model should be developed and
tested. However, because the inter-
nal consistency and construct valid-
ity of the scales used to measure the
constructs were generally good,
these scales may be used in the
future to represent the designated
constructs. The lone exception
would be the satisfaction subscale
because item 1 needs to be modi-
ified.

Implications of Findings

One implication of great rele-
vance to sport marketers was that
individual motives explained a
great deal of variance in team iden-
tification. Thus, as hypothesized,
certain motives, or combinations of
motives, seem to predict levels of
identification. Because of the
strong role played by identification
in spectator loyalty and behavior
(Wann & Branscombe, 1993),
building high levels of identification
is important to sport marketers and
managers. Thus, marketers could
seemingly utilize the motives that
correlate strongly with identification
to better market their sport.

For example, because vicarious
achievement and aesthetic motives
are highly related to identification
(β = .629 and β = .616, respec-
tively), marketers could design ad
campaigns and/or slogans that rep-
resent those motives. Indeed, one
author’s university’s athletic de-
partment utilized a new coach’s brave
prediction that his team would be
successful against an arch rival to
sell tickets and travel accommoda-
tions to the away game (i.e., they
utilized the vicarious achievement
motive). Such advertisements
should serve to heighten the identi-
fication that helps to influence
future spectator consumer behavior.
Further, because different fans consume sport due to different motives, motives could be utilized as a segmentation variable to better target fans. Marketers could design campaigns based on the various motives to capture spectators' attention. For example, fans motivated by aesthetics would be receptive to a very different type of ad than fans motivated by the social aspects of the game. To entice fans with different motives, sport marketers could conduct market research to determine the motives most applicable to their sport and develop suitable marketing campaigns based on the results.

Another finding with implications for sport managers was that confirmation or disconfirmation of expectancies explained a large amount of the variance in spectators' affective states at the conclusion of the game. While this seems quite logical (i.e., fans are happy after a win and upset after a loss) and is supported by previous research (Midkiff & Griffin, 1992; McAuley & Duncan, 1989), it also suggests that spectators' affective states may be somewhat managed as a result of their expectancies. Essentially, as Madrigal's (1995) results and these results indicate, spectators appear to be happier after an unexpected win or more upset after an unexpected loss. Therefore, building up the opponent's strengths to the media to temper fans' expectations may be a wise practice.

**Limitations**

Several limitations should be noted. First, the sample was shown to identify highly with the teams in question, creating a lack of variance on that variable. This lack of variance could have contributed to the surprisingly low relationship between identification and expectancies. In addition, although this sample was representative of spectators at these particular basketball games, it may not be representative of the public as a whole. As in any such research, the future models should be tested with a variety of samples to determine whether the particular model holds within the population.

Further, as noted by Trail et al. (2000), situational and demographic variables that may influence the model are not included. For example, satisfaction with venue service characteristics has been shown to affect return intentions (Trail, Anderson, & Fink, 2002; Chang, 2000).

Finally, some concern surfaced that the first order latent variables representing the second order latent variable motive are disparate and would lead to different self-esteem responses and affective states, given specific outcomes (Fink, Trail, & Anderson, 2002). The high values of these path coefficients suggest otherwise for all of the motives, except for family. It could be argued that the need to associate with family is not in fact a motive per se, but rather an environmental influence on attendance behavior. Future research should examine differences between motives, which indicate reasons for being a spectator, and environmental characteristics, which influence attendance at the event, such as family, economic cost, promotions, advertising, business opportunities, etc.

**Conclusion**

In summary, this model of sport spectator consumption incorporates many formerly studied variables into a comprehensive whole, but it does not do an adequate job in explaining the variance in consumption behavior. Future research should develop and test a modified model that would improve dramatically on the model proposed by Trail et al. (2000) tested by this study. Hopefully, based upon the results of this study, a new model could be proposed that explains more variance in consumption behavior and would become a viable vehicle for marketers and managers of sport teams to improve season ticket sales and merchandise sales.

**References**


Mitra, J. R. (1999). The “sudden death” of hockey in Hartford: Sports fans and fran-


