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Within sport management research, disconfirmation/confirmation of expectancies, satisfaction, and mood responses have been examined by several researchers (e.g., Madrigal, 1997; Trail, Anderson, & Fink, 2005; Trail, Fink, & Anderson, 2003) and have been deemed to be primary determinants of consumption intentions, BIRGing/CORFing behaviors, and actual consumption. However, inconsistencies exist in the measuring of these dimensions. Thus, the purpose of this research is to improve the existing research and propose new modified measures of (dis)confirmation, satisfaction, and mood.

The aforementioned researchers have used satisfaction theory (Oliver, 1989; 1993; 1996) to explain the relationships among these constructs. Oliver (1977) originally used one-dimensional measures of both (dis)confirmation of expectancies and affect (mood). He has also used a one-dimensional measure of general satisfaction (Oliver, 1989). He has since created a bi-dimensional scale for mood (positive and negative) and created a scale to measure product-attribute satisfaction (Oliver, 1993). Oliver noted that the product-attribute satisfaction subscale was distinct from a general measure of satisfaction because the correlation between the two was only moderate (r = .50). Oliver (1996) measured disconfirmation of expectancies using a three-item measure that included (dis)confirmation of benefits, problems, and performance. The scale had good internal consistency when measuring responses to automobiles, but a rather poor alpha value when measuring responses to academic courses.

Madrigal (1995) used Oliver’s (1996) satisfaction theory to develop his own model of sport fan satisfaction and based some of the items measuring (dis)confirmation, affect (mood), and satisfaction on Oliver’s items. Madrigal used two items to measure (dis)confirmation of expectancies: one measured how well the team played and the second measured the quality of play of the offense and defense, and the result of the game. They reported YY = .81 and an AVE value of .60. Additionally, they used both positive (happy, cheerful, and delighted) and negative (disappointed, upset, and irritated) mood subscales, as had Oliver (1993). Both had good internal consistency (YY = .93 & .87, respectively) and construct reliability (AVE = .83 & .69 respectively). Trail et al. (2003) used three items to measure general satisfaction: satisfied, satisfied with the outcome, and satisfied with the performance of the team. However, both the internal consistency and the construct reliability were low (YYyn = .63, AVE = .47). Trail et al. (2005) used the same items for all of the subscales except for the satisfaction item - I am satisfied, which was modified to - I am satisfied with my decision to attend, (p. 104) similar to one of Madrigal’s (1995) items. This improved the satisfaction subscale (YYyn = .75, AVE = .57). In evaluating, the factor loadings of the items, Trail et al. (2005) noted that the satisfaction with the decision to attend item loaded below .707. This indicated that there was more unique variance associated with that item than common variance. Several other items, while still seeming to represent their respective factors, caused us to question whether the satisfaction subscale and the (dis)confirmation subscale were each unidimensional. We began to suspect that, similar to Oliver (1993), there might be two dimensions of satisfaction: one measuring satisfaction with the performance of the team and one measuring satisfaction with the outcome. If this was the case, then there might also be two expectancy dimensions as well: expectations about performance and expectancies about the outcome of the game. In each case, the dimensions would probably be related, but might have differential relationships with the mood subscales. Thus, we created two three-item subscales: one to measure the confirmation or disconfirmation of expectancies about the quality of performance and one to measure (dis)confirmation of expectancies about outcome. We also created a 4-item satisfaction-with-performance subscale and a 3-item satisfaction-with-outcome subscale.

Confirmation and disconfirmation exist on a continuum in which negative disconfirmation is hypothesized to create the greatest negative mood, positive confirmation to create a moderately positive mood, positive confirmation to create a moderately negative mood, and positive disconfirmation to create the greatest positive mood. However, Trail et al.’s (2005) limitations section noted a potential ceiling effect existed, thus potentially causing the effects of certain paths to - be attenuated and
underrepresent the impact—(p. 110)—of certain variables in the model. To attempt to ameliorate that problem, we added two items each to the positive and negative mood subscales to expand the range of mood responses. For the positive mood subscale, we included - ecstatic-“ and - thrilled-” and we included - despondent/depressed-” and - dejected/miserable-” to the negative mood subscale. We hypothesized that this would create a better distribution of responses and more closely match the framework of disconfirmation and confirmation of expectancies. Thus, the purpose of this research was to test the new scales in terms of reliability and discriminant validity.

Data were collected from 246 students who were taking classes in the Department of Health and Human Performance at a large mid-western university in the United States. The average age of the participants was 21.38 years and 91.4% of the respondents self-identified as White/Caucasian (non-Hispanic) origin.

SPSS 14.0 was used to evaluate the internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha coefficients). The RAMONA Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) technique in SYSTAT 7.0 was used to run a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). From these results we evaluated the factor loadings, the construct reliability (average variance extracted: AVE) values, and the discriminant validity.

The results supported two distinct dimensions for (dis)confirmation of expectancies, and two distinct dimensions for satisfaction. The construct reliability and internal consistency values were good for all six subscales (Â¥ = .86 - .97; AVE = .64 -.84). Changing the mood subscales did not seem to improve their relationships with the (dis)confirmation framework in this data set. Although the distribution of responses improved slightly, the correlations between the (dis)confirmation subscales and the mood subscales did not improve over the Trail et al. (2005) data. In addition, the hypothesized relationship between negative mood and positive mood was not apparent in the modified scales.

In summary, people seem to have expectancies that can be either confirmed or disconfirmed, about both the performance of the team(s) and the outcome of the game, and they seem to be distinct. Furthermore, these individuals were also differentially satisfied with the performance and outcome of the event. Thus, researchers may want to include responses toward both outcome and performance in future research. The modified mood subscales did not work as well as hoped, and need further refinement and testing on new populations.