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The goal of this study was to examine the relationship between spectators’ emotions, satisfaction, and behavioural intentions at football games. A survey was conducted among spectators of the top Portuguese professional football league during eight games (n = 466). The sport emotion questionnaire was used to assess spectators’ emotions and the results gathered from a structural equation model suggest that analysis of specific emotions is crucial to understand spectators’ responses. Findings provide evidence that only the emotion of joy has a positive direct effect on satisfaction, as well as an indirect effect on behavioural intentions, via satisfaction. In turn, dejection has a negative direct effect on behavioural intentions, while satisfaction positively influences behavioural intentions. These results suggest managerial implications, such as the need to improve stadium atmosphere and social facilitation in order to provide an enjoyable overall experience to the spectators, and contribute to overall spectator satisfaction and positive behavioural intentions.
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Introduction

Football is a deeply rooted sport in European countries and attracts millions of fans to the stadiums every year (Vallerand et al., 2008). The recognised value of spectators for the club brand image and sustainability (Richelieu & Pons, 2009) serves as the basis for the development of many marketing programmes to increase spectators’ satisfaction at the sporting events and recruit new consumers. Matsuoka, Chelladurai and Harada (2003) suggest that satisfaction has a strong link with the intentions to attend future games and recommend attending to others. In addition, Neeley and Schumann (2000) have suggested that satisfaction is influenced by consumption-related emotions. Based on this evidence, research on the link between emotions and post-purchase reactions is crucial to assist club managers in the development of strategies for increasing spectator attendance and improving customer retention.

The analysis of emotions during consumption experiences has been one of the key issues in the marketing literature (Neeley & Schumann, 2000; Richins, 1997; Söderlund & Rosengren, 2004). Still, there is a lack of consensus in the use of
terminology related to emotions (Bagozzi, Gopinath, & Nyer, 1999) that is particularly evident in the sports literature (Jones, Lane, Bray, Uphill, & Catlin, 2005). Also, several studies in sport settings have focused on emotions as outcome variables (Funk & Pritchard, 2006; Madrigal, 2008), but with few exceptions (e.g. Sumino & Harada, 2004), little is known about the array of different emotions experienced by spectators during sporting events and how specific emotions contribute to increase satisfaction and behavioural intentions. Thus, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between football spectators’ emotions at stadiums with satisfaction levels and behavioural intentions.

Literature review and hypotheses

Emotions and sporting events

Although there is a lack of consensus when defining emotions among researchers (Scherer, 2005; Vallerand & Blanchard, 2000), it is commonly accepted that an emotion is a response to a stimulus event (Deci, 1980; Scherer, 2005), and involves subjective experiences (cognitive component), physiological changes (arousal component) and action tendencies (e.g. body posture or facial expressions). In addition, there is little consistency in the use of the terms emotion, affect, mood and attitude in previous literature (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Jones et al., 2005), and there are important theoretical distinctions to consider. The term affect covers a set of mental processes including emotions, moods and attitudes (Rosenberg, 1998), while the other three terms differ in several aspects. Specifically, emotions are often expressed physically through gestures, postures or facial features, and may determine specific actions (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Deci, 1980). Also, emotions are more intense and shorter than moods and attitudes (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Lane & Terry, 2000). Another distinction between these terms is that emotions are generally elicited by stimulus events (Kwak, Kim, & Hirt, 2011) and arise in response to a cognitive appraisal and/or neurophysiological symptoms (Scherer, 2005), while moods are elicited by the effect of an emotion, an organismic condition or the general environmental conditions (Frijda, 1994), representing an enduring state (Parkinson, Totterdell, Briner, & Reynolds, 1996). In turn, both attitudes and emotions can arise from changes in events, but attitudes can also occur in response to mundane objects. That is, attitudes are not dependent on arousal, which is a necessary component of emotions (Bagozzi et al., 1999). Moreover, emotions are directly related to action, while attitudes may require an additional motivation impetus (Bagozzi, 1992).

A growing body of literature demonstrates the importance of understanding emotional reactions in service industries (e.g. Söderlund & Rosengren, 2004; Wong, 2004; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 1999, 2004). However, little has been examined about the emotions experienced by spectators at sporting events and its consequences. Of the few studies conducted on this topic, Madrigal (1995) noted that the affective state during a basketball game was a significant predictor of fan satisfaction, while Trail, Fink and Anderson (2003) noted that the affective state was crucial on future fan behaviour. Still, both studies did not provide a discussion about the wide range of emotions experienced by sport spectators. In a similar study, Madrigal (2003) noted that spectators experience a wide range of emotions during basketball games, and that they feel more positive emotions (e.g. pride, admiration) than negative emotions.
(e.g. anger) when their favourite team was successful. However, this study did not consider the potential impact of emotional contagion of the crowd on participants' responses given that the emotions were examined in a controlled environment. Furthermore, emotions were analysed based on mere valence (positive or negative) and the behavioural consequences of specific emotions were ignored. In turn, Sumino and Harada (2004) considered six categories of emotions (joy, anger, sadness, excitement, worry and love) from the Consumption Emotion Set (CES: Richins, 1997) to measure the affective experience of football fans at the stadium. This study examined the relationship between specific emotions and subsequent behavioural intentions. However, the CES was not developed for use in the sporting context and the factorial validity was not accessed, representing an important limitation to analysing spectators' emotions.

The context analysis is fundamental to the study of emotions (Lazarus, 2000), and therefore, emotional constructs designed in sport settings (Isberg, 2000; Jones et al., 2005; Lazarus, 2000) should be considered when examining emotions at sporting events. Jones et al. (2005) developed the sport emotion questionnaire (SEQ) using both qualitative and quantitative approaches, and identified five emotion categories covering a range of both unpleasant and pleasant emotions. The unpleasant emotions are anger (response to an event perceived as being offensive), anxiety (reflects the uncertainty of attaining a goal) and dejection (results from the gap between the individual's expectations and the activity in progress), while the pleasant emotions are happiness (results from the positive experience with the sports), and excitement (favourable expectations of reaching a specific goal). The SEQ showed evidence of factorial validity, criterion validity, and proved to be a valid tool to measure emotions. To that extent, the SEQ was used in the current research to examine the emotions experienced by spectators during football games.

Emotions and satisfaction

It is widely accepted that emotions during service consumption are important predictors of customer satisfaction (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Oliver, Rust, & Varki, 1997; Söderlund & Rosengren, 2004). Achieving customer satisfaction is a primary strategic goal for sport organisations given that satisfied customers are more likely to repeat the consumption experience than dissatisfied ones (Leeweun, Quick, & Daniel, 2002). Cronin and Taylor (1992) refer to satisfaction as the consumer experience emerging as a reaction of the service encounters, and Oliver (1997) suggests that satisfaction requires experience-dependency and involves emotions. Still, satisfaction is suggested to be distinct from consumption emotions, in that emotions are evaluated by consumers and represent an antecedent of satisfaction (Mano & Oliver, 1993). In addition, satisfaction can be measured either as a transaction-specific or an overall level (Lam, Shankar, Erramilli, & Murphy, 2004). Transaction-specific satisfaction refers to a specific service encounter, while overall satisfaction refers to the cumulative evaluation of all encounters and experiences between the consumer and the organisation (Jones & Suh, 2000). The current research focuses on overall satisfaction because it represents a better indicator of the past and present performance of an organisation (Vilares & Coelho, 2005), and previous research suggests that the overall satisfaction is a better predictor of future behaviours as compared to transaction-specific satisfaction (Jones & Suh, 2000).
Thus, the overall satisfaction is defined as the spectator’s experience resulting from attending football games during the season.

According to Zeelenberg and Pieters (2004), there are two ways to analyse the impact of emotions on satisfaction: the valence-based approach and the specific emotion approach. The valence-based approach consists of summing up all types of emotions in one single currency according to its valence (positive or negative). This is a parsimonious approach, yet, ignores the contribution of specific emotions in each valence to the customer satisfaction. In turn, the specific emotion approach focuses on idiosyncratic elements of each emotion (Lerner & Keltner, 2000), with each specific emotion representing a response to the appraisal of specific situations that may impact consumer satisfaction and future behaviours (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Otnes, Lowrey, and Shrum (1997) suggest that many positive and negative emotions are experienced during a consumption episode. However, different emotions may impact spectators’ evaluation of the football games in different ways. Madrigal (2003) reported that unpleasant emotions during a sporting event were negatively related with satisfaction. Accordingly, Zeelenberg and Pieters (1999) noted that disappointment and regret contributed to customer dissatisfaction. Conversely, positive emotions typically increase customer satisfaction (Oliver et al., 1997), and the joy derived from the games is strongly related with spectator’s satisfaction (Madrigal, 1995). Thus, the analysis of customer satisfaction should take into account the specific emotions during consumption episodes (Söderlund & Rosengren, 2004). Based on the previous literature regarding sport, emotions and satisfaction, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1a: Anxiety experienced during games negatively influences overall satisfaction.
H1b: Dejection experienced during games negatively influences overall satisfaction.
H1c: Anger experienced during games negatively influences overall satisfaction.
H1d: Happiness experienced during games positively influences overall satisfaction.
H1e: Excitement experienced during games positively influences overall satisfaction.

**Emotions and behavioural intentions**

A common assumption in the service-related literature is that positive emotions stimulate favourable behavioural intentions, whereas negative emotions have the opposite effect (Schoefer & Diamantopoulos, 2008). According to Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1996), favourable behavioural intentions include aspects such as saying positive things and recommending the service to others, paying a price premium, or expressing cognitive loyalty to the organisation. Conversely, unfavourable behavioural intentions include aspects such as complaining to friends or external agencies, switching to competitors and decreasing the amount of business to the company. Based on the work of Zeithaml et al. (1996), Cronin, Brady and Hult (2000) focused on the positive aspects of behavioural intentions and developed a construct related to repurchase intentions, word-of-mouth communication and customer loyalty. This approach has been successfully adopted into the sport settings (Yoshida & James, 2010), and as such, we define behavioural intentions as the spectator’s favourable intention to attend future games, recommend them to others, and purchase team products and services.

Hong, Macdonald, Fujimoto and Yoon (2005) suggested that the positive emotional bond with the club is crucial to spectator’s intention to attend games and
buy merchandise. Sumino and Harada (2004) found that excitement was a predictor of the intentions to attend future games. On the contrary, negative emotions during service consumption experiences may induce unfavourable behavioural intentions (Bougie, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2003). For example, Zeelenberg and Pieters (2004) reported that disappointment was a significant predictor of switching and negative word-of-mouth. These studies highlight the need to examine the behavioural tendencies associated to each specific emotion (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 1999, 2004). Thus, the following hypotheses were developed to examine the impact of such emotions:

H2a: Anxiety experienced during games negatively influences behavioural intentions.
H2b: Dejection experienced during games negatively influences behavioural intentions.
H2c: Anger experienced during games negatively influences behavioural intentions.
H2d: Happiness experienced during games positively influences behavioural intentions.
H2e: Excitement experienced during games positively influences behavioural intentions.

Satisfaction and behavioural intentions

The analysis of consumer behavioural intentions is one of the key issues in the service marketing literature because of its relevance to the success of firms (Zeithaml et al., 1996), and many studies have noted a significant relationship between satisfaction and behavioural intentions (Cronin et al., 2000; Martin, O’Neill, Hubbard, & Palmer, 2008). However, specificity in the behavioural responses associated with different emotional experiences implies that satisfaction by itself is not enough to understand specific behaviours in which customers will engage (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 1999). Early research suggested that satisfaction mediates the effect between costumers’ emotions and subsequent behavioural intentions (Louro, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2005; Oliver et al., 1997; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). In sport settings, Matsuoka et al. (2003) noted that satisfaction with past experiences increases the probability to attend future games. More recently, Bodet and Bernache-Assollant (2011) reported that spectators’ satisfaction contributes positively to the intentions to attend future games of their favourite team and the sport in general, while Kuenzel and Yassim (2007) found that joy had an indirect effect on revisit intentions and word-of-mouth, via satisfaction. Furthermore, Nyer (1997) found that behavioural intentions are best predicted through the use of satisfaction measures together with measures of emotions. As such, it is hypothesised that:

H3a: Satisfaction has a mediating effect between anxiety and behavioural intentions.
H3b: Satisfaction has a mediating effect between dejection and behavioural intentions.
H3c: Satisfaction has a mediating effect between anger and behavioural intentions.
H3d: Satisfaction has a mediating effect between happiness and behavioural intentions.
H3e: Satisfaction has a mediating effect between excitement and behavioural intentions.

Method

Participants and data collection

The study sample consisted of spectators from the top Portuguese professional football league who voluntarily accepted to participate under the guarantee of anonymity of their responses. Data were collected during eight games at a stadium.
located in Lisbon using a convenience sample and the methods for data collection were the same for each game. Three experienced surveyors and a supervisor distributed a total of 586 self-administered questionnaires randomly after the end of the games to supporters of the home team aged 18 years or older, either within the stadium premises or immediate surroundings. The questionnaires were completed at that moment and returned to the surveyors after completion. It should be noted that the top Portuguese professional football league had an average attendance of 5814 spectators per game in the 2009–2010 season, and that the stadium where data were collected had an average attendance of 24,602 spectators. Consequently, any generalisations of the results should be made with caution. After data screening, 466 questionnaires were deemed usable for data analysis for an effective response rate of 79.5%. Ages of the respondents ranged from 18 to 65 years, with a mean of 31 years old. A total of 333 participants were males (71.5%) and 128 were females (28.5%). There were 101 responses (21.7%) from affiliated supporters of the team (members of organised groups of ultra-fans), 354 from non-affiliated supporters (76%). 11 respondents (2.3%) did not answer the corresponding question. Of all respondents, 390 (83.7%) saw the team they supported win the game, while 76 (16.3%) saw their team lose.

**Instrument**

The questionnaire included demographic questions and a total of 28 items separated into two sections. The first section included the 22 items proposed in SEQ (Jones et al., 2005) to assess the emotions of anxiety, dejection, anger, happiness and excitement. All items were measured utilising a 5-point Likert-type scale, anchored by ‘not at all’ (1) and ‘extremely’ (5), in order to assess how spectators felt during the games. The second section was designed to assess ‘Satisfaction’ and ‘Behavioural Intentions’. The 3-item scale proposed by Vilares and Coelho (2005) to assess overall satisfaction with service providers was adapted to the sport setting. Participants were asked to indicate satisfaction levels with their team games through a 5-point Likert-type scale, anchored by ‘not satisfied at all’ (1) and ‘extremely satisfied’ (5). ‘Behavioural Intentions’ were measured through two items suggested by Yoshida and James (2010), and one item adapted from Zeithaml et al. (1996). These three items were also measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, anchored by ‘not likely at all’ (1) and ‘extremely likely’ (5). Both SEQ and behavioural intentions scale were translated to Portuguese and back-translated to English to ensure the accuracy between the original scales and the necessary translated versions (Banville, Desrosiers, & Genet-Volet, 2000).

**Data analysis**

A two-step maximum likelihood structural equation modelling procedure was performed using AMOS 18.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago IL). First, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to confirm the measurement model. Reliability of the constructs was estimated through Cronbach’s $\alpha$ coefficients and values above the .70 criterion were considered reliable (Nunnally & Berstein, 1994). The average variance extracted (AVE) was estimated to evaluate convergent validity and values greater than .50 were considered to demonstrate convergent validity (Fornell &
Results

Measurement model

The results of the CFA showed that the factor loadings from one item of ‘Anxiety’ and another from ‘Dejection’ failed to exceed the cut-off point of .50 (Hair et al., 2005), and as such, were eliminated (Table 1). Also, AVE values for Happiness and Excitement were lower than its squared correlations (.84), indicating lack of discriminant validity. Based on this evidence, the items of Happiness and Excitement were grouped in a single construct. Next, a scale refinement was conducted and only the four items loading the highest on this construct were selected for further analysis in order to ensure reliability and parsimony of the model (Table 1). This pleasant emotion was named ‘Joy’ to better reflect the item content and supporting literature (Madrigal, 1995; Sumino & Harada, 2004). The final measurement model consisted of 22 items, with four items representing the ‘Anxiety’, ‘Dejection’, ‘Anger’ and ‘Joy’ subscales, while three items represented the ‘Satisfaction’ and ‘Behavioural Intentions’ measures.

As indicated in Table 1, all items showed high factor loadings ranging from .617 to .913, while the Z-values ranged from 13.57 to 26.19. These results indicate that each item did load significantly on its construct. The Cronbach’s α values supported the constructs reliability, ranging from .76 (‘Satisfaction’) to .92 (‘Joy’). Convergent validity was accepted for all constructs given the AVE values of each met accepted levels and ranged from .54 (‘Anxiety’ and ‘Behavioural Intentions’) to .74 (‘Joy’), with a mean of .63. Descriptive statistics for the constructs and its correlations are reported in Table 2. ‘Joy’ was the emotion with the highest mean score (M = 3.29; SD = 1.18) while ‘Dejection’ had the lowest mean score (M = 1.61; SD = 1.04). Regarding the other constructs, participants showed higher levels of ‘Behavioural Intentions’ (M = 3.54; SD = 1.12) than ‘Satisfaction’ (M = 3.20; SD = .86). Evidence of discriminant validity was accepted since none of the squared correlations exceeded the AVE values for each associated construct.

In addition, the results obtained in the final measurement model indicated an acceptable fit to the data [$\chi^2(194) = 569.84$ ($p < .001$), $\chi^2/df = 2.94$; CFI = .95, GFI = .90, RMSEA = .07 (CI = .058, .071)]. The $\chi^2$ statistic was significant.
(p < .001), however, its ratio to the degrees of freedom was within the usually accepted range. Also, it is important to consider other indices given that $x^2$ statistic is sensitive to sample size (Hair et al., 2005). Both CFI and GFI values meet the recommended criteria for good fit, while RMSEA was indicative of acceptable fit. Overall, the final measurement model showed an acceptable fit to the data and was within the required criteria for good psychometric properties. Consequently, the structural model was examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs/Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Z-value</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneasy</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dejection</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dejected</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritated</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furious</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyful</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhilarated(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of satisfaction with my team games</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations fulfilment regarding to my team games</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of my team games with ideal game</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The probability of attend future games of my team</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The likelihood to recommend my team games to other people</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The likelihood to purchase other products and services of my team</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Item eliminated due to the lack of individual reliability.
\(^b\)Item eliminated after scale refinement.
The examination of the structural model included a test of the overall model fit as well as individual tests of the relationships among latent constructs. As a result of the scale’s refinement, H1d and H1e were combined into H1d, while H2d and H2e were grouped into H2d in order to test the effect of ‘Joy’ on ‘Satisfaction’ and ‘Behavioural Intentions’, respectively. Similarly, H3d and H3e were combined into H3d to test the mediating effect of ‘Satisfaction’ between ‘Joy’ and ‘Behavioural Intentions’. The overall assessment of the structural model indicated an acceptable fit to the data \[\chi^2(194) = 569.84 \ (p < .001), \ \chi^2/df = 2.94, \ CFI = .95, \ GFI = .90, \ RMSEA = .07 \ (CI = .058, .071)\]. The path coefficients for the model are illustrated in Figure 1. With regards to the relationship between specific emotions and Satisfaction, only ‘Joy’ (\(b = .51, \ p < .01\)) showed a significant linear effect supporting H1d. Path coefficients for ‘Anxiety’, ‘Dejection’ and ‘Anger’ were not significant (\(p > .05\)) in predicting ‘Satisfaction’. Therefore, H1a, H1b and H1c were not supported. All together, emotions accounted for approximately 33% of the variance of ‘Satisfaction’ (\(R^2 = .33\)). The relationship between specific emotions and ‘Behavioural Intentions’ was only significant for ‘Dejection’ (\(\beta = -.34, \ p < .05\)), which supports H2b. Path coefficients for ‘Anxiety’, ‘Anger’ and ‘Joy’ were not significant (\(p > .05\)) and consequently, H2a, H2c and H2d were not confirmed. Finally, the effect of ‘Satisfaction’ (\(\beta = .60, \ p < .01\)) on ‘Behavioural Intentions’ was statistically significant. Also, ‘Joy’ (\(\beta = .31, \ p < .05\)) showed a significant indirect effect on ‘Behavioural Intentions’ supporting H3d. However, H3a, H3b and H3c were not confirmed given that the indirect effects of ‘Anxiety’ (\(\beta = -.02, \ p > .05\)), ‘Dejection’ (\(\beta = -.06, \ p > .05\)), and ‘Anger’ (\(\beta = .02, \ p > .05\)) on ‘Behavioural Intentions’ were not significant. Approximately 53% of the variance of ‘Behavioural Intentions’ (\(R^2 = .53\)) was explained by emotions and ‘Satisfaction’.

### Discussion and conclusions

This research examined the relationships between specific emotions, satisfaction and behavioural intentions. The results of the factorial structure obtained for the measurement model indicated that negative emotions were distinct from each other as previously suggested in the service-related literature (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 1999, 2004). However, the two initial pleasant emotions in the current study indicated a
lack of discriminant validity. This finding may be related to the difficulty in obtaining measurements of pure emotions in a research setting. Given that emotions are short-lived and often stimulate other close emotional reactions (Bagozzi et al., 1999), this is particularly relevant in a sport event setting. For example, when a spectator is excited with the game atmosphere, he or she may also have other positive emotional reactions such as enthusiasm, happiness or gladness.

In addition, this study makes a significant contribution to the sports literature by highlighting the importance of a specific emotion approach, rather than a valence-based approach, to understand post-purchase reactions of the spectators. The structural equation analysis indicated that only H1_d, H2_b and H3_d were confirmed, and these findings suggest important managerial implications. With regards to the effect of specific emotions on ‘Satisfaction’, ‘Joy’ was the only significant predictor, giving support to H1_d. This link is consistent with previous research indicating that joy during a sporting event has a positive influence on spectator’s satisfaction (Kuenzel & Yassim, 2007; Madrigal, 1995). ‘Joy’ is an intense feeling related to the appraisal of obtaining a previously set goal (Lazarus, 2000), and in the current study, it was the emotion that participants ranked the highest, suggesting that sporting events are consumed primarily for enjoyment (Madrigal, 2003). Koo et al. (2009) suggest that the core product in spectator sports stimulates emotional reactions and affects spectators’ satisfaction. This highlights the contribution of the quality of the home team, and opponent characteristics to the overall evaluation of the sporting events. However, the on-field performance is unpredictable and clubs need to identify other critical factors that may be able to stimulate spectators’ joy in order to raise satisfaction levels. Previous research points out that social facilitation (sharing the experience of the sporting event with others) and auditory senses (noise of the crowd) are important predictors of spectators’ joy (Kuenzel & Yassim, 2007). As such, club managers should provide socialising opportunities to spectators and try to motivate them to take part in the co-creation process of the football games.

Figure 1. Estimated standardised direct effects for the structural model.
Note: *p < .05; **p < .01.
achieved, for example, through social events before and after the games (Kuenzel & Yassim, 2007), discounted tickets for families and groups, or special tickets that combine the game itself and a meal in the concession areas. Also, clubs can motivate spectators to be co-creators of the service by stimulating the supporters’ rituals through the use of spotlights, and using the megascreens to display the lyrics of the club’s anthem or other familiar songs. These experiential marketing strategies contribute to the overall spectators experience at the stadium and could potentially be highlighted by clubs when promoting future games.

Regarding the relationship between each emotion and ‘Behavioural Intentions’, only the path coefficient for ‘Dejection’ was found to be significant, thus confirming H2b. Considering that dejection is related to the disconfirmation of expectations (Jones et al., 2005), this finding is consistent with research suggesting that failed services remain in the mind and induce consumer's negative returns (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). In addition, this finding suggests that the decision to attend games does not depend only on team performance (Wakefield & Sloan, 1995) given that 87.3% of the participants in the current study attended games where their team won the match. Wong (2004) suggested that service encounters such as customer contact with frontline employees could determine positive behavioural responses, while Koenigstorfer, Groeppel-Klein and Kunkel (2010) reported that the ambiance at the stadium is crucial to enhance the attractiveness of a sporting event. Thus, it could be argued that by improving peripheral services (e.g. facility access, seat comfort, cleanliness of the toilets and responsiveness of employees) and the game atmosphere (e.g. facility aesthetics and crowd experience), clubs may reduce the gap between spectators’ expectations and the actual service delivery, and therefore positively influence behavioural intentions (Yoshida & James, 2010).

A significant relationship between ‘Satisfaction’ and ‘Behavioural Intentions’ was also identified. This highlights that satisfied spectators are more likely to attend future games, recommend them to others, and purchase team products and services, which is consistent with several previous studies in sport settings (Kuenzel & Yassim, 2007; Matsuoka et al., 2003; Yoshida & James, 2010). Still, evidence of the mediating effect of ‘Satisfaction’ between emotions and ‘Behavioural Intentions’ was only found through ‘Joy’, which supports H3a. Although emotions are short-lived, the consistent role of joy on spectators’ overall satisfaction with team games is important to ensure spectators’ behavioural intentions. Based on these findings, the implementation of a fan satisfaction survey, and periodical interviews with spectators (season ticket holders, and single ticket purchasers) to gain their opinion about past experiences and future expectations could provide useful insights for club management. The spectators’ opinion about the overall performance of the club is important to improve the ambiance at the stadium and satisfy the hedonistic consumption needs of consumers (Uhrich & Koenigstorfer, 2009). This will likely contribute to spectator retention, and consequently the maximisation of the economic profits for the sport organisation (Richelieu & Pons, 2009).

Taken together, findings from this study indicate that ‘Joy’ has a positive direct effect on ‘Satisfaction’ and an indirect effect on ‘Behavioural Intentions’. ‘Dejection’ has a negative direct effect on ‘Behavioural Intentions’, while ‘Satisfaction’ has a positive direct effect on ‘Behavioural Intentions’. The combined effects of emotions and ‘Satisfaction’ explained 53% of the variance in ‘Behavioural Intentions’, highlighting the emotional value of the football games (Uhrich & Koenigstorfer,
Also, relationships among the constructs suggest the importance of the specific emotion approach (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004) to properly understand the spectator experience along with post-purchase reactions. Still, these findings should be interpreted with caution for two primary reasons. First, despite the lack of influence by some emotions on ‘Satisfaction’ and ‘Behavioural Intentions’, it does not necessarily mean that management should ignore them. A variety of studies contend the strong influence of some of these discrete emotions in consumer responses. For example, Bougie et al. (2003) noted that anger was a significant predictor of switching behaviours and negative word-of-mouth. Contrary, Sumino and Harada (2004) stated that this unpleasant emotion positively influenced the spectators’ commitment with the team, and also reported that excitement was a predictor of the intentions to attend future games. In addition, Louro et al. (2005) found that pleasant emotions such as pride can reduce consumer’s repurchase intentions, and that these effects were independent of satisfaction. A second reason for taking caution with these results is that a great percentage of variance in ‘Behavioural Intentions’ remains unexplained. The analyses of other concepts proposed in the literature such as brand image (Beccarini & Ferrand, 2006), service quality (Theodorakis & Alexandris, 2008), competitive balance (Koenigstorfer et al., 2010) and the BIRGing/CORFing phenomena (Kwak et al., 2011), alongside with emotions might represent an important step to better understand spectators’ satisfaction and subsequent behavioural intentions.

Limitations and future research

As with any research, there are limitations in this study that should be considered in future investigations. First, data were collected at the end of the games and only one sample from one football league was used. Despite the advantage of having fresh memories about the consumption experience, the participants may have been influenced by team’s performance in those specific games. Future research should be extended to other European football leagues and collect data at additional games across the temporal frame of the hedonic experience (Zillmann, 1996). The comparison between data collected before, during and after the sporting events may also be important to understand the role of emotions in spectators’ behaviour. Second, the SEQ was not specifically developed for sport spectators and may not adequately represent the great variety of emotions experienced by spectators during football games. Additional research should therefore re-examine the factorial structure of SEQ in order to better assess its appropriateness to sport spectators. Also, it may be important to include other discrete emotions as regret, disappointment (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004), sadness, love (Sumino & Harada, 2004), admiration (Madrigal, 2003) and pride (Louro et al., 2005) to reinforce the understanding of the wide range of emotional values of the football games. Third, the outcome of the games was not controlled given that this study focused on the overall satisfaction (cumulative experiences) rather than on the transaction-specific satisfaction (concerning a specific game). Still, previous research suggests that transaction-specific satisfaction may influence overall satisfaction (Jones & Suh, 2000). Given that overall satisfaction was measured at the end of the games, spectator responses may have been influenced by the just-completed experience at the stadium, particularly the game outcome (e.g. less emotions of anger). The collection
of data several days after the consumption experience is suggested as a future research objective in order to control for the potential effect of a specific game. Also, additional research should control the result of the games (balanced proportion of supporters who watched their team win and lose the games), and measure the satisfaction both as a transaction-specific and as an overall level in order to ensure that spectators’ responses are not biased by the game outcome. Fourth, the psychological investment of participants with the team was assessed only through its affiliation on groups of ultra-fans. Consumers with stronger psychological links with the team and more knowledge of the sport itself may be more critical when judging a sporting event (Madrigal, 2003). Thus, additional research should collect more diverse samples of spectators (e.g. season ticket holders, prior experience with football) as a way to compare emotions in different groups of consumers in the stadium. Fifth, while the focus of the current study was to analyse the effect of specific emotions on satisfaction and behavioural intentions, future research could investigate the specific stimuli that cause each emotional reaction. For example, Koenigstorfer et al. (2010) suggest that there are three types of stimuli during a sporting event: organiser-induced, spectator-induced and game-induced. Future research could examine the effect of these three types of stimuli on spectators' emotions. Finally, only behavioural intentions were used to evaluate the spectators' commitment with the team. This interaction with the team is not the only available measurement of the spectators’ allegiance with the team. Future research should focus on other constructs such as brand loyalty and use both behavioural and attitudinal dimensions (Kaynak, Salman, & Tatoglu, 2008) as a means to examine commitment.
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