International Journal of Business in Sports, Tourism & Hospitality Management
https://www.gaics.org/Joumal/JBSM

Perceived NFL Fan Experience and Stadium Satisfaction

Joshua S. Greer
Cumberland University
Tim Wilson
Middle Tennessee State University

Abstract

This study examines perceived fan experience and stadium satisfaction across all National Football League (NFL) venues using 539,660 publicly available online reviews from Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor. A multi-platform analytical approach was employed to assess variation in satisfaction ratings and examine relationships between stadium characteristics and fan evaluations. Results indicate high overall satisfaction (M = 4.52/5), with consistent platform-level differences, as Yelp ratings were significantly lower than Google and TripAdvisor. Correlation and regression analyses revealed no statistically significant relationships between seating capacity or stadium age and fan satisfaction, suggesting that structural characteristics alone do not explain perceived experience. Rather, findings support the growing importance of electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) as a scalable and ecologically valid indicator of consumer sentiment. This study contributes methodologically by demonstrating how large-scale digital review data can be used to assess sport venue performance, while offering practical implications for managing platform-specific feedback and enhancing fan engagement strategies.

Keywords: National Football League; fan experience; sport venue satisfaction; digital sentiment; stadium reviews

---

Joshua S. Greer is an Assistant Professor and Director of Graduate Sport Management at Cumberland University. His work integrates quantitative and applied methodologies to advance scholarship at the intersection of sport business, analytics, and higher education. Tim Wilson is a Leisure and Sport Management Lecturer at Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. His main areas of research include sport marketing, intercollegiate athletics, sport/event safety and security, and combat sports.

1. Perceived NFL Fan Experience and Stadium Satisfaction in the Digital Era

Stadiums are more than just physical spaces for sporting events; they serve as cultural landmarks that shape fan identity, foster community bonds, and enhance the overall experience for spectators. The fan experience goes beyond the game itself, including emotional involvement, social interactions, and sensory experiences within the venue. As the sports industry continues to grow, understanding what affects fan satisfaction has become increasingly crucial for sport managers, marketers, and facility designers.

Although existing research has examined attendance patterns, ticket pricing, and revenue generation, relatively little attention has been given to how fans perceive the in-venue experience, primarily through digital feedback channels. Online review platforms such as Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor have become important venues where spectators share authentic, experience-based evaluations of sports venues. These user-generated reviews provide valuable insights into perceived service quality, stadium atmosphere, and overall satisfaction from fans' perspectives.

Within the context of the National Football League (NFL), each of the 30 stadiums offers a unique mix of architectural style, fan culture, and regional identity. Historic venues such as Lambeau Field evoke nostalgia and tradition, whereas newer stadiums, such as SoFi Stadium, emphasize modem amenities and digital features. This variety provides an ideal setting for examining how physical characteristics, emotional bonds, and fan identities influence perceived satisfaction.

This study aims to (1) analyze how stadium features like age, capacity, and fan satisfaction relate to each other through large-scale digital ratings, and (2) demonstrate how online review data can serve as a reliable resource for researchers and sport management professionals to evaluate the fan experience. By integrating concepts from environmental psychology, consumer behavior, and digital word-of-mouth, this research contributes to the growing sport management literature on improving fan satisfaction in contemporary professional sports.

Research Questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

RQ1: How do fan satisfaction ratings differ across online review platforms (Google, Yelp, TripAdvisor)?

RQ2: To what extent do stadium characteristics (e.g., age, seating capacity) relate to overall fan satisfaction?

RQ3: Can aggregated online review data serve as a reliable and scalable indicator of perceived fan experience in professional sport settings?

1. Literature Review

Research on the sport fan experience has grown significantly over the last twenty years, indicating the increasing complexity of spectator engagement with sports environments. Initially, studies primarily examined economic and demographic factors influencing attendance. However, recent

research now emphasizes psychological, technological, and environmental influences on fan satisfaction and loyalty. This transition reflects the broader evolution in sports consumption, from a mainly in-person activity focused on the game to a hybrid experience that incorporates digital elements, social identity, emotion, and interactivity.

The modem fan experience is multifaceted, shaped by game outcomes, service quality, environment, emotional connections, and technology. Researchers have explored how fans derive meaning from both tangible aspects, such as stadium design, and intangible elements, including social bonds and symbolic associations with teams and venues. In particular, the physical setting, emotional engagement, and new digital platforms create a connected system in which fans evaluate their experiences and express satisfaction.

Recent progress in digital communication and consumer analytics has opened up new methods for studying sport consumer behavior. User-generated content, such as onhne reviews, social media posts, and digital fan communities, provides valuable insights into perceptions of quality and experience. These platforms allow researchers to analyze authentic, unsolicited feedback that captures fans' real-time experiences, providing insights that supplement traditional survey approaches.

The existing body of literature offers a strong basis for examining how fans perceive, interpret, and evaluate sports venues in the digital era. By synthesizing prior research on fan engagement, facility management, emotion psychology, and digital behavior, this section establishes the theoretical foundation for analyzing online reviews of NFL stadiums using Sportscape Theory, the Stimulus-Organism-Response model, and electronic word-of-mouth theory.

Fan Engagement

Fan engagement remains a key factor in increasing satisfaction during live sporting events. Research indicates a strong positive link between fan engagement and overall enjoyment, atmosphere, and loyalty (Karuppusamy et al., 2025). Engaged fans contribute to creating an energetic and memorable game-day environment that enhances the overall experience (Leite, 2023). Technological advances, such as mobile apps and social media platforms, further enhance engagement by providing real-time updates, personalized content, and interactive features (Karuppusamy et al., 2025). These digital tools transform fans from passive spectators into active participants, strengthening their emotional bonds with teams and sporting events.

Stadium Amenities and Infrastructure

The quality of stadium infrastructure and amenities also significantly influences fan satisfaction. A structural analysis of professional baseball venues revealed that service quality, seating comfort, and concession options significantly impact loyalty and satisfaction, often surpassing the influence of team performance (Tanaka, 2021). Similarly, Brochado et al. (2021) highlighted that sports organizations must design stadiums to provide comprehensive experiences beyond the game. High-quality facilities, convenient accessibility, and thoughtfully designed environments directly enhance fans' perceived value and attachment to

the venue.

Recent studies have also highlighted how fan experiences have evolved through the use of immersive technologies that blend digital and physical engagement. Leite (2023) described this shift as a transition "from broadcasting to immersive experience," in which data intelligence and virtual interfaces allow fans to interact with sports in more meaningful ways. The use of augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) in stadium settings enhances interactivity, attracts larger audiences, and fosters greater emotional investment.

Emotional Connection and Loyalty

Emotional factors are equally crucial to understanding fan loyalty and satisfaction. Liu and Huang (2022) found that emotional states, such as excitement, JOY, and anxiety, significantly influence loyalty and behavioral intentions among football fans. These emotional experiences play a key role in building lasting bonds with both teams and venues. When fans experience positive emotions in stadiums, they are more likely to develop strong psychological connections and stay engaged with their teams.

Creating emotionally meaningful experiences can strengthen these psychological bonds, encouraging ongoing attendance, advocacy, and brand loyalty. For professional sports organizations, understanding what drives emotional satisfaction allows for more strategic fan engagement efforts that incorporate technology, atmosphere, and social connection. Emotional bonds form the core of the fan experience, while the physical setting offers the structural foundation for satisfaction. The stadium serves as a symbolic and sensory environment that shapes fans' perceptions of comfort, atmosphere, and a sense of belonging. These tangible aspects interact with emotional components to forge a comprehensive experience that influences loyalty and behavior. To understand how physical spaces affect fan satisfaction, reviewing established theoretical models, beginning with Sportscape Theory, is essential to explain environmental and behavioral interactions in sports venues.

Sportscape Theory

Sportscape Theory, originally proposed by Wakefield and Sloan (1995), provides a fundamental framework for understanding how the physical and social environments of sports venues affect spectators' satisfaction, enjoyment, and behavioral intentions. The theory suggests that the facility's design and quality directly influence a fan's overall perception of value and likelihood of returning. Important elements of the sportscape include seating comfort, visual appeal, accessibility, crowd atmosphere, layout efficiency, and cleanliness, all of which collectively shape the perceived quality of the spectator experience.

Within this framework, the sportscape extends beyond the physical stadium to encompass emotional and sensory cues that shape the event's atmosphere. Elements such as lighting, sound, crowd energy, and even scent shape the overall ambiance and can evoke strong emotional responses. When these environmental factors are well coordinated, they enhance fan satisfaction and strengthen loyalty to the team and the venue.

Conversely, negative physical or sensory experiences can reduce enjoyment, regardless of the game's outcome or team performance. In this study, aggregated online reviews are viewed as digital reflections of sportscape assessments. Each review or rating provides a small-scale evaluation of the environmental and social factors that influence the fan experience. By analyzing these digital evaluations, researchers can gain insights into how fans interpret and respond to different aspects of the stadium environment. Using online review data enables the extension of Sportscape Theory into the digital era, offering a contemporary means of understanding how physical space and fan perceptions intersect in professional sports settings.

Sportscape Theory emphasizes how physical and social environments affect spectator satisfaction but primarily focuses on the venue itself. To better understand how environmental cues generate emotional and behavioral reactions, additional theoretical insights are needed. The Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-0-R) framework offers a useful perspective by demonstrating the psychological processes connecting environmental stimuli to fans' observable responses. This framework enhances the sportscape concept by illustrating how external elements, such as stadium design and atmosphere, activate internal emotional and cognitive states that ultimately shape fans' perceptions and behaviors.

Stimulus-Organism-Response Framework

The Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-0-R) framework (Mehrabian & Russell, 1974), rooted in environmental psychology, suggests that external stimuli (S) influence internal emotional and cognitive states (0), which then lead to behavioral or expressive responses (R), such as approach or avoidance. In sports venues, the attributes of the stadium serve as stimuli, while fans' internal judgments, such as satisfaction, comfort, and nostalgia, are responses of the organism. The visible outcomes, including digital reviews or the desire to revisit, are also responses. The S-0-R model helps explain how the environment shapes the digital expressions of satisfaction.

In sports venues, the physical features of a stadium, such as its design, lighting, acoustics, and crowd density, serve as stimuli that elicit emotional and cognitive responses in spectators. These internal reactions, or the organism component, encompass feelings such as excitement, nostalgia, or comfort, as well as mental judgments related to satisfaction, perceived value, and attachment. Lastly, the response phase involves observable actions or expressions, such as fans' intentions to return, word-of-mouth promotion, or, in this study's context, the digital reviews and ratings shared on public platforms.

Applying the S-0-R framework provides a deeper understanding of how fans convert sensory and emotional experiences within the stadium into evaluative outcomes. It links environmental conditions to consumer expression by explaining how fans perceive, interpret, and communicate their experiences online. In this study, the S-0-R model serves as a key link that links the tangible features ofNFL stadiums (stimuli) to fans' internal states of satisfaction and emotional engagement (organism), which ultimately manifest in their digital reviews (response).

The Stimulus-Organism-Response framework illustrates how stadium environmental stimuli trigger emotional and behavioral reactions, but it doesn't detail how these outcomes are conveyed or shared after the event. In today's digital age, fans frequently share their perceptions and experiences through online platforms, fostering a public dialogue that extends beyond traditional consumer behavior. This digital interaction can be best understood through Electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM) Theory, which explains how personal experiences give rise to collective sentiment within online communities.

Electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM) Theory

The concept of Electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM) was introduced by Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004) to describe any positive or negative statements made by consumers about a product, service, or experience that are shared publicly through digital platforms. eWOM serves as a powerful extension of traditional interpersonal communication by enabling individuals to share their experiences with a broad, diverse online audience. These consumer-generated opinions shape collective perceptions, influence purchasing decisions, and provide organizations with authentic, real-time feedback on their performance.

In sports, eWOM has become a key tool for understanding how fans share their experiences and satisfaction levels. Platforms such as Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor now function as modem public spaces where fans openly review stadium experiences, comment on amenities, and evaluate the atmosphere of live events. Unlike survey data, which can be limited by researcher bias or sampling issues, eWOM data are unsolicited and voluntary, providing a more genuine reflection of fan opinions. As a result, these online expressions serve both as reactions to the Sportscape and as signals to future fans who rely on peer reviews when deciding whether to attend games or visit specific venues.

From a theoretical perspective, eWOM offers the communication link that connects the S-O-R framework to modem fan behavior. After fans encounter the stimuli of a stadium environment and process those impressions internally, their emotional and cognitive reactions show up externally through online reviews and digital engagement. These interactions not only document individual experiences but also help shape a collective narrative that influences brand reputation, fan identity, and perceived stadium quality. This study applies eWOM Theory to interpret online ratings and reviews as credible, quantifiable indicators of fan satisfaction. By analyzing these digital cues, researchers can assess how stadium features, emotional bonds, and fan identity interact to shape perceptions and judgments of NFL venues.

Integrative Conceptual Framework

By combining Sportscape Theory, the Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) framework, and Electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM) Theory, we gain a comprehensive view of how fans perceive and evaluate their stadium experiences in today's digital era. These frameworks illustrate how the physical and social aspects of a venue influence spectators' internal emotions and how these experiences are shared publicly through online

platforms.

Sportscape Theory lays the groundwork by highlighting the significance of environmental and design elements like seating comfort, accessibility, aesthetics, and crowd atmosphere in shaping the fan experience (Wakefield & Sloan, 1995). The S-O-R framework then builds on this by explaining the psychological processes that happen when fans respond to these stimuli. In this model, stadium features act as stimuli (S) that trigger internal emotional and cognitive reactions, such as satisfaction, excitement, nostalgia, or attachment, within the organism (0), which ultimately lead to responses (R) like behavioral intentions, advocacy, or digital expressions of satisfaction.

The inclusion of eWOM Theory places these behavioral outcomes within the larger digital communication ecosystem. Once fans experience and process their emotions and thoughts, they often tum those responses into publicly available online reviews. These reviews serve as expressions of both personal satisfaction and collective sentiment, influencing how other potential viewers and stakeholders perceive the venue. Therefore, eWOM functions both as the result of the S-O-R process and as a feedback loop that can shape future consumer actions.

This integrative framework provides a comprehensive approach to understanding perceived fan experience by linking environmental design, psychological processes, and digital communication. The model suggests that stadium attributes (stimuli) influence fans' emotional and cognitive responses (organism), which, in tum, affect online reviews and ratings (response). Moderating factors, such as fan identification, place attachment, and stadium legacy, are expected to either strengthen or weaken these relationships. Fans with high team identification or strong emotional ties to a venue may assess the same stimuli differently than casual attendees, highlighting the importance of psychological connection in shaping digital expressions of satisfaction. This theoretical integration offers a comprehensive perspective on how the physical, emotional, and communicative aspects of fandom interact. It also treats online reviews as valid, measurable extensions of the fan experience, connecting traditional sport management research with modem digital analytics.

Conceptual Framework

Building on the integration of Sportscape Theory, the Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) framework, and Electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM) Theory, this study introduces a conceptual model that illustrates the connections among the environmental, psychological, and digital aspects of the fan experience. The model explains how fans' perceptions of physical stadium features are processed internally and then reflected in observable online actions.

In this framework, stadium attributes function as the stimuli (S), the external environmental factors that influence a fan's sensory and cognitive engagement during live events. These attributes encompass tangible elements, such as seating comfort, accessibility, design quality, cleanliness, and acoustics, as well as intangible aspects, including crowd atmosphere, team culture, and regional identity. Collectively, these factors define the Sportscape and serve as initial triggers for fans to evaluate.

The organism (0) component reflects the fan's internal emotional and cognitive responses to these stimuli. Emotional reactions may include excitement, nostalgia, joy, or a sense of belonging, whereas cognitive evaluations involve satisfaction, perceived value, and the extent to which expectations are met. These internal processes reveal how individuals perceive their experience within the stadium environment and are crucial in determining the overall quality of the fan experience. The response (R) reflects behavioral or expressive outcomes, such as a fan's intention to return, recommend the experience to others, or, in this study's focus, post digital reviews and ratings on public platforms. Online reviews serve as an evaluative summary of the fan experience, providing measurable data that indicate satisfaction levels, emotional impressions, and perceived venue quality.

Moderating variables further refine the framework by explaining differences in how fans perceive and express their experiences. Fan identification, the degree to which a person psychologically connects with a team, can boost emotional responses and tolerance toward environmental flaws. Place attachment, or the emotional bond formed between fans and a specific venue, may influence how individuals interpret both positive and negative aspects of their experience. Lastly, stadium legacy, defined by a facility's age, historical importance, and cultural symbolism, can improve perceptions of authenticity and emotional connection, even when modem amenities are absent.

This model builds on existing research by demonstrating how environmental factors in NFL stadiums elicit emotional and cognitive responses that manifest through digital fan expressions. By linking physical design, psychological engagement, and online communication, the framework provides a comprehensive foundation for examining how modem fans experience and express satisfaction in both physical venues and digital spaces.

2. Methodology

Data Source and Sample

This study analyzed fan-written reviews from Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor to assess perceptions of all 30 NFL stadiums. Although there are 32 NFL teams, two pairs, namely, the New York Giants and Jets at MetLife Stadium, and the Los Angeles Rams and Chargers at SoFi Stadium, share venues, resulting in 30 unique stadiums. Each platform utilizes a five-star rating system, enabling a straightforward comparison of user satisfaction across venues. These reviews are publicly available, user-generated evaluations of stadium experiences that serve as a current, reliable indicator of fan sentiment.

To support satisfaction ratings, secondary data on stadium opening years were gathered from official team and venue records to assess facility age and historical importance. The dataset includes all 30 NFL venues, with opening years ranging from 1957 (Lambeau Field) to 2020 (SoFi Stadium). Older venues like Lambeau Field (1957), Arrowhead Stadium (1972), and Highmark Stadium (1973) symbolize legacy environments closely tied to fan nostalgia, while newer facilities such as SoFi Stadium (2020), Allegiant Stadium (2020), and U.S. Bank Stadium (2016) showcase the

league's latest technological and architectural advancements. Including the year of opening enables comparison between legacy and modem venues, providing a measurable indicator of stadium age and its effects on satisfaction and perceived authenticity.

The dependent variable was the overall average rating for each stadium, reflecting fans' perceived satisfaction. Independent variables included stadium age (year opened), seating capacity, and facility classification (legacy versus new generation). Composite venue ratings were calculated as review-count-weighted averages of Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor scores; a platform-wise z-score normalization sensitivity check produced the same rank order. Legacy classification was based on venues opened before 2000, while those opened after 2000 were categorized as new-generation facilities.

Reviews for all 30 venues were collected in October 2025 to ensure a consistent time frame across platforms. Data from each stadium were combined across the three review sources to create a composite satisfaction score, taking into account differences in user base and review volume. Composite venue ratings were calculated using a review-count-weighted average of Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor scores. A sensitivity analysis using z-score normalization by platform produced the same rank order, confirming consistency and reliability across aggregation methods. This multi-platform approach improved validity by reducing potential bias from any single source.

Analytical Procedures

The analytical design used a quantitative, multi-platform approach to gain a thorough understanding of the perceived fan experience. Descriptive statistics helped identify central tendencies and variability in stadium ratings across platforms. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to examine the relationships among stadium attributes, including age, capacity, classification, and overall satisfaction. Multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess how these variables predicted fan satisfaction, while also addressing potential collinearity and confounding factors. This analytical framework enabled an objective, data-driven evaluation of how environmental and structural characteristics influence fan perceptions across digital review platforms.

Validity and Reliability

Using online review data offers clear methodological benefits by capturing authentic, unsolicited feedback from fans that reflects real experiences rather than researcher-led responses. This enhances ecological validity, allowing for the observation of naturally occurring consumer sentiment within authentic digital environments. The risk of self-selection bias was minimized because of the large sample size of 539,660 reviews and the multi-platform dataset, which together reduced the influence of extreme opinions or platform-specific biases.

Online review analysis is a popular method in hospitality, tourism, and sports management research for measuring service quality and customer satisfaction. By combining data from various platforms, employing robust quantitative analyses, and applying cross-validation techniques, this

study provides a comprehensive and reliable assessment of fans' perceived experiences across NFL venues.

3. Results

Descriptive Results of Fan Ratings

Analysis of data from all 30 NFL stadiums revealed variation in fan satisfaction across venues (see Table 1). The overall average rating was 4.52 out of 5, indicating generally high levels of satisfaction across platforms. Stadium-level ratings ranged from 3.90 at Northwest Stadium (Washington Commanders) to 4.80 at Lambeau Field (Green Bay Packers). Review volume differed substantially by platform. Google accounted for 495,855 reviews, followed by TripAdvisor (30,767) and Yelp (13,038). Mean ratings also varied across platforms, with Google producing the highest average rating (M = 4.58), followed by TripAdvisor (M = 4.24) and Yelp (M = 3.71). On average, Yelp ratings were 0.87 points lower than Google and 0.53 points lower than TripAdvisor, indicating systematic differences in platform-level evaluations (see Table 2).

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics of NFL Stadium Ratings Across Platforms (N = 30 Stadiums)

Measure	Value
Total Reviews	539,660
Overall Mean Rating	4.52
Highest Stadium Rating	4.80
Highest Rated Stadium	Lambeau Field (Green Bay Packers)
Lowest Stadium Rating	3.90
Lowest Rated Stadium	Northwest Stadium (Washington Commanders)

Using composite weighted averages, the highest-rated stadiums included Lambeau Field (4.80), Lucas Oil Stadium (4.68), Mercedes-Benz Stadium (4.68), Acrisure Stadium (4.68), and GEHA Field at Arrowhead Stadium (4.67). Lower-rated venues included Northwest Stadium (3.90), Levi's Stadium (4.20), Paycor Stadium (4.37), Soldier Field (4.45), and Raymond James Stadium (4.45). These descriptive differences highlight variation in overall satisfaction but do not independently identify specific drivers of fan experience.

Table 2.

Platform-Level Breakdown

Platform	Number of Reviews	Mean Rating	Difference from Google	Difference from TripAdvisor
Google	495,855	4.58		+0.34
TripAdvisor	30,767	4.24	-0.34	
Yelp	13,038	3.71	-0.87	-0.53

Note. Ratings are based on a 5-point scale. Composite statistics reflect aggregated data across all 30 NFL stadiums. Differences indicate mean rating deviations across platforms.

Relationship Between Stadium Characteristics and Satisfaction

Pearson correlation analysis indicated no statistically significant relationship between seating capacity and overall fan satisfaction ($r = .29$, $p = .116$). Although the relationship was positive, the lack of statistical significance indicates that seating capacity alone does not meaningfully predict variation in fan satisfaction ratings. Similarly, regression analysis with seating capacity as the sole predictor yielded a low explanatory value ($R^2 = .09$), indicating that approximately 9% of the variance in satisfaction ratings was accounted for by seating capacity.

Stadium age was also not significantly associated with satisfaction ($r = -.26$, $p > .05$). While the negative direction suggests that older venues may receive slightly higher ratings on average, this relationship was not statistically significant and should be interpreted with caution. Taken together, these findings indicate that structural characteristics, such as seating capacity and stadium age, are not strong predictors of overall fan satisfaction in this dataset.

Influence of Stadium Age Classification

Using the classification framework outlined in the methodology, stadiums were categorized as legacy (opened before 2000) or new generation (opened in 2000 or later). Descriptive comparisons revealed that several legacy venues, including Lambeau Field, GEHA Field at Arrowhead Stadium, and Highmark Stadium, ranked among the highest in overall satisfaction. Conversely, some newer venues, such as SoFi Stadium and Levi's Stadium, received comparatively lower composite ratings.

However, given the absence of statistically significant relationships between age and satisfaction, these patterns should be interpreted as descriptive rather than causal. Additionally, the classification does not account for major renovations or facility upgrades, which may influence contemporary fan perceptions.

Platform-Level Comparison

Cross-platform comparisons revealed consistent differences in rating patterns. Google ratings were generally higher than those on TripAdvisor and Yelp, while Yelp consistently produced the lowest average scores across venues. TripAdvisor ratings fell between the two. These differences likely reflect variation in platform user bases and review behaviors rather than differences in the

underlying stadium experience. The relative consistency in ranking order across platfonns supports the use of composite weighted ratings as a stable indicator of overall fan satisfaction.

Interpretive Summary

The results show that fan satisfaction ratings differ across stadiums and platfonns, with consistently high overall ratings but notable differences in platform-specific patterns. Importantly, structural factors such as seating capacity and stadium age were not statistically significant predictors of satisfaction, indicating that these elements alone do not account for variations in fan evaluations.

Given the reliance on aggregated rating data, the findings should be interpreted as indicators of overall evaluative satisfaction rather than as direct measures of specific experiential or emotional processes. While theoretical frameworks such as Sportscape Theory and the Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) model provide useful conceptual context, the current analysis does not directly measure environmental stimuli or internal emotional responses. Instead, the results align more closely with electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) theory, as online ratings constitute observable, consumer-generated evaluations of stadium experiences. As such, this study supports the use of large-scale digital review data as a practical and scalable approach for assessing perceived fan satisfaction in professional sport setting.

Table 3.

Summary of Key Findings and Theoretical Interpretation

Component	Empirical Find-mg	Statistical Evidence	Interpretation	Theoretical Alignment
Overall Satisfaction	High average ratings across all stadiums	M = 4.52 (5-point scale)	NFL stadiums receive consistently strong fan evaluations	eWOM
Platform Differences	Ratings vary systematically by platform	Google (4.58), TripAdvisor (4.24), Yelp (3.71)	Platform-specific user behavior influences evaluation patterns	eWOM
Seating Capacity	No significant relationship with satisfaction	r=.29,p=.116;R^2 =.09	Stadium size does not meaningfully predict fan satisfaction	S-O-R
Stadium Age	No significant relationship with satisfaction	r = -.26, p > .05	Older vs. newer venues do not significantly differ in satisfaction	S-O-R
Legacy vs. New Generation Trends	Legacy stadiums appear in higher rankings (descriptive)	Non-significant relationship	Observed differences are descriptive and not causal	Sportscape
Measurement Scope	Ratings reflect overall evaluation rather than specific expenences	Aggregated star ratings	Emotional and cognitive processes are not directly measured	Limitation noted
Data Source Validity	Large-scale online reviews provide consistent patterns across platforms	N = 539,660 reviews	Digital reviews serve as stable indicators of perceived satisfaction	eWOM
Theoretical Implication	Observable outcomes reflect	Based on aggregated ratings	Findings align more directly with	eWOM, S-O-R

	consumer evaluation rather than internal processes		evaluative expression than psychological mechanisms	
Methodological Contribution	Multi-platform aggregation improves reliability of satisfaction measurement	Cross-platform consistency	Demonstrates scalability and practical application of digital data in sport management research	eWOM

4. Discussion and Implications

The findings of this study show that fan satisfaction at NFL stadiums is generally high but varies significantly across different venues and digital platforms. Importantly, the results reveal that structural features such as seating capacity and stadium age are not statistically significant predictors of fan satisfaction. This indicates that commonly assumed drivers of the stadium experience, such as size and modernization, do not independently account for differences in how fans perceive their experiences. Instead, the variations in ratings across stadiums indicate the influence of factors not directly captured in this dataset. While previous research highlights the importance of atmosphere, identity, and emotional connection, the current findings suggest these elements are not fully captured by structural variables alone. Therefore, fan satisfaction should be regarded as a multidimensional construct that extends beyond observable facility characteristics.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings partly align with Sportscape Theory but do not provide direct empirical evidence for its core mechanisms. The observed descriptive patterns, especially the strong performance of certain legacy venues, support the idea that environmental and symbolic factors influence fan evaluations. However, because this study relies on aggregated rating data, it does not directly measure specific sportscape elements such as aesthetics, accessibility, or crowd dynamics. Therefore, while the results align with the overall assumptions of Sportscape Theory, they should be viewed as suggestive rather than definitive. Future research incorporating direct measures of environmental features or fan perceptions would be needed to more thoroughly test these relationships.

Similarly, the application of the Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) framework in this study is mainly conceptual rather than empirical. While the framework offers a useful perspective on how environmental stimuli may influence internal emotional states and subsequent behaviors, the current analysis does not directly measure the organismic component, such as emotional or cognitive responses. Instead, the use of aggregated star ratings only reflects the outcome of the response stage. Therefore, the findings do not

provide a direct test of the full S-0-R process and should not be viewed as evidence of causal psychological mechanisms. This distinction is important to ensure alignment between theoretical claims and empirical measurement.

In contrast, the results strongly support electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) theory as a useful framework for understanding fan evaluations in digital settings. Online review sites constitute large, publicly accessible collections of consumer opinions, enabling the aggregation of fan experiences across different venues and situations. The consistent variations seen across Google, TripAdvisor, and Yelp ratings indicate that specific user behaviors and expectations influence how satisfaction 1s expressed on each platform. At the same time, the overall trends remain relatively consistent across platforms, demonstrating that aggregated review data can be a reliable indicator of perceived fan satisfaction. These findings highlight the importance of eWOM both as a research tool and as a theoretical perspective for studying sport consumer behavior.

Methodologically, this study advances sport management research by demonstrating the scalability and practical usefulness of large-scale digital review data. Unlike traditional survey methods, which are often limited by sample size and response bias, online reviews offer naturally occurring, unsolicited feedback that reflects real-world consumer experiences. Using a multi-platform dataset further improves reliability by minimizing the influence of any single source. However, relying on aggregated ratings also introduces key limitations, as these measures condense multiple aspects of the fan experience into a single evaluative score. Consequently, while this approach effectively assesses overall satisfaction, it does not capture the specific experiential elements that shape fan perceptions.

From a managerial perspective, the findings underline the importance of monitoring and managing digital fan feedback across different platforms. Given observed variations in rating behavior, sports organizations should implement platform-specific strategies for engagement and reputation management. For instance, Google reviews can serve as a general indicator of overall sentiment, while Yelp may offer more critical and detailed feedback on specific aspects of the expenence. Furthermore, the lack of significant associations between structural variables and satisfaction indicates that investments in facility size or modernization alone may not yield meaningful improvements in fan perceptions. Instead, organizations should prioritize enhancing elements of the fan experience that more directly influence overall evaluations, such as service quality, accessibility, and in-stadium engagement.

Overall, this study highlights eWOM data as a valuable and scalable method for measuring fan satisfaction in professional sports environments. While traditional theoretical frameworks such as Sportscape Theory and the S-0-R model still hold relevance for understanding the broader fan expenence, the current findings indicate that aggregated online ratings are better viewed as indicators of evaluative outcomes rather than direct measures of underlying psychological processes. By aligning the methodological

approach with the theoretical interpretation, this research offers a more accurate and well-supported contribution to the study of digital sport consumer behavior.

Managerial Implications

The findings of this study offer valuable guidance for sport managers, marketers, and facility operators aiming to boost fan satisfaction in professional sports settings. The lack of statistically significant links between structural features such as seating capacity and stadium age and fan satisfaction suggests that investing solely m physical infrastructure may not yield meaningful improvements in the perceived experience. While technological upgrades and premium amenities remain vital for revenue and competitive advantage, they should not be regarded as the primary drivers of overall satisfaction. A more well-rounded approach that focuses on service quality, accessibility, and overall event execution could have a greater impact on how fans perceive their experiences.

Furthermore, digital platforms have become essential for understanding and managing fan perception. Online reviews provide extensive, real-time feedback that reflects naturally occurring consumer evaluations, offering organizations a valuable supplement to traditional survey methods. By regularly monitoring review trends across platforms, sports organizations can identify common concerns, assess the success of operational changes, and compare performance with similar venues. At the same time, aggregated ratings provide broad evaluations rather than specific details of the experience, underscoring the need to integrate these insights with more focused feedback tools. Using text-based analytics, such as sentiment analysis and keyword tracking, can further enhance the extraction of actionable insights from these data sources.

Differences in rating patterns across Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor also highlight the importance of platform-specific engagement strategies. Each platform reflects distinct user behaviors and expectations, which shape how satisfaction is expressed. Google reviews, due to their accessibility and volume, serve as a general indicator of public opinion and visibility. Yelp, in contrast, tends to gather more critical and detailed feedback, often from highly engaged or local users. TripAdvisor occupies an intermediate position, representing a mix of visitor perspectives and experience-based assessments. These differences suggest that sports organizations should tailor their engagement efforts accordingly, remammg responsive and consistent while recognizing the distinct role each platfonn plays in shaping public perception. Encouraging post-event feedback via mobile apps, QR codes, or follow-up communication can further boost digital engagement and make fan input more representative.

The patterns seen m stadium ratings also suggest that experiential and symbolic factors may influence opinions beyond what is directly measured in this study. Although concepts such as fan identity and place attachment were not specifically studied, differences in satisfaction across venues suggest that these factors may still shape how fans evaluate their experiences. Managers should consider this carefully but might

adopt strategies to boost the social and cultural aspects of the fan experience. Adding local traditions, emphasizing team history, and creating opportunities for shared moments can help make the environment more engaging and memorable. By focusing on both operational efficiency and enriching experiences, sports organizations can enhance satisfaction and build lasting fan loyalty.

Theoretical and Methodological Implications

The integration of digital review data into sport management research represents a significant advancement in methodology, particularly for studying fan satisfaction and consumer behavior. Unlike traditional survey methods that rely on researcher-designed instruments and controlled sampling, electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) data provide naturally occurring, unsolicited expressions of consumer opinions. This improves ecological validity by capturing fan perceptions in real-world settings rather than in structured research environments. The dataset used in this study, comprising over 500,000 reviews across multiple platforms, demonstrates the capacity of digital data to support large-scale, comparative analyses that are difficult to conduct with conventional methods. Additionally, this approach enables analysis of fan sentiment across various contexts, venues, and user groups, providing a broader and more representative view of consumer experiences in professional sports.

Using data from multiple platforms not only enhances scalability but also increases robustness, thereby strengthening the reliability of results. Variations across Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor illustrate how platform-specific behaviors influence the expression of satisfaction, while consistent rating patterns reinforce the validity of combined measures. However, this approach has notable limitations: aggregating star ratings reduces complex, multi-faceted experiences into a single score, hindering the identification of specific satisfaction drivers and the assessment of emotional or cognitive responses. This underscores the importance of integrating quantitative ratings with qualitative analysis in future studies. Techniques such as sentiment analysis, natural language processing, and machine learning offer promising avenues for extracting deeper insights from textual reviews, enabling researchers to better understand how fans interpret and communicate their experiences.

From a theoretical perspective, this study advances the understanding of how fan experience is defined and measured in digital settings. While frameworks such as Sportscape Theory and the Stimulus-Organism-Response model remain useful for explaining the links among environmental factors, psychological processes, and behavioral outcomes, the current findings underscore the need to carefully align theoretical claims with available data. Using aggregated rating data captures observable evaluative results but does not directly measure the internal processes central to these models. Therefore, the findings are better seen as reflecting the response aspect of fan behavior rather than the entire sequence of environmental and psychological interactions. This distinction underscores the importance of methodological accuracy when applying established theories to new types of data.

Simultaneously, the results emphasize the importance of electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) theory as a key perspective for understanding fan evaluations in modem sport environments. Online reviews serve as digital expressions of consumer judgment, connecting in-venue experiences with wider public perception. The merging of physical experiences and digital communication indicates that fan behavior is no longer limited to the stadium but extends into online spaces where evaluations are shared, interpreted, and amplified. This study contributes to the growing body of research that considers digital platforms essential to the sport consumption experience. By showing both the strengths and limitations of using aggregated review data, it offers a basis for future research to better incorporate environmental, psychological, and digital aspects of fan engagement.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study offers valuable insights into fan satisfaction across NFL stadiums, several limitations should be considered when interpreting the results. Using online review data offers clear benefits in scale and authenticity; however, it also introduces the risk of self-selection bias. People who leave reviews may have particularly strong positive or negative experiences, which can bias the overall ratings. Although the large sample size helps lessen this issue, the data may not fully reflect the views of more moderate or less involved fans. Therefore, the results should be interpreted as reflecting expressed consumer opinions rather than as a complete picture of all fans.

The temporal scope of the data also presents a limitation. All reviews were collected within a single time frame in October 2025, providing a cross-sectional snapshot rather than a longitudinal view of fan satisfaction. Stadium conditions, team performance, promotional strategies, and facility upgrades may change over time, potentially influencing how fans evaluate their experiences. Consequently, the results do not account for seasonal variation or longer-term trends in fan perception. Future studies that incorporate longitudinal data collection would allow researchers to examine how satisfaction evolves across multiple seasons and in response to organizational or environmental changes.

Variation in platform-specific user behavior adds an extra factor to consider. Differences observed in ratings across Google, Yelp, and TripAdvisor likely reflect not only stadium experience differences but also variations in user demographics, expectations, and review styles. For example, Yelp tends to receive more detailed and critical feedback, whereas Google attracts a broader, more general audience. These differences complicate direct platform comparisons and underscore the need for cautious interpretation of aggregated ratings. While using multiple platforms improves overall reliability, future studies could benefit from a more detailed look at platform-specific user traits and their effects on review patterns.

Another limitation concerns the measurement level used in the analysis. The study relies on aggregated star ratings, which provide an efficient and scalable means of assessing overall satisfaction but fail to capture the complex, multidimensional fan experience. Important factors linked to

fan behavior, such as emotional response, perceived atmosphere, and social interaction, are not directly measured within this framework. As a result, the study cannot identify specific drivers of satisfaction or empirically test theoretical mechanisms related to environmental and psychological processes. This limitation highlights the need for more detailed data collection and analysis methods in future research.

Opportunities for future research arise from both methodological and theoretical perspectives. Incorporating text-based analytics, such as sentiment analysis, natural language processing, and machine learning, would enable researchers to move beyond aggregated ratings and examine the qualitative aspects of the fan experience in greater detail. These methods could reveal how fans describe atmosphere, service quality, and emotional involvement, providing a clearer link to theoretical concepts. Broadening the analysis to include additional variables like team performance, ticket prices, opponent strength, and event type would also improve understanding of the contextual factors influencing fan evaluations.

Further research across different sports contexts would enhance the generalizability of these findings. Comparative studies involving other professional leagues, collegiate athletics, or international sports settings could highlight significant differences in how fans evaluate stadium experiences across various environments. Including concepts such as fan identification, place attachment, and community affiliation would also help clarify how psychological and social factors influence both in-venue experiences and digital expressions of satisfaction. Building on the methodological foundation established in this study, future research can better integrate environmental, behavioral, and digital aspects of sports consumer behavior.

5. Conclusion

This study advances research on sport facilities and consumer behavior by analyzing perceived fan satisfaction across NFL stadiums using large-scale digital review data. The results show that fan ratings are generally high across venues but differ significantly between stadiums and platforms. Notably, structural features such as seating capacity and stadium age were not significant predictors of satisfaction, suggesting that these factors alone do not account for differences in fan perceptions. This supports the view that fan satisfaction is a complex, multidimensional construct that extends beyond observable facility features and cannot be fully understood by structural variables alone.

The results also highlight the importance of electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) as a practical and scalable method for measuring fan evaluations. Online review platforms offer a rich source of consumer-generated data that reflects real-world perceptions across various contexts and user groups. While relying on aggregated star ratings can limit the ability to analyze specific experiential details, the recurring patterns across different platforms support the reliability of digital reviews as indicators of overall satisfaction. Therefore, this study advances methodological approaches in sport management by demonstrating how large-scale, multi-platform data can be used to evaluate fan experience in an efficient and realistic manner.

From a theoretical standpoint, this research situates traditional frameworks like Sportscape Theory and the Stimulus-Organism-Response model within a modem digital context, while recognizing the limitations of the current data in directly testing these models. The results more closely align with eWOM theory, as the analysis reflects observable evaluative outcomes rather than internal emotional or cognitive states. This distinction highlights the importance of matching theoretical frameworks with suitable measurement methods when studying fan behavior in digital settings. By clarifying this relationship, the study helps improve understanding of how in-venue experiences translate into publicly shared evaluations.

In practical terms, the results highlight the increasing importance of integrating digital feedback into sport venue management and fan engagement strategies. As the sports industry continues to evolve in an increasingly connected and data-driven environment, the ability to monitor, interpret, and respond to online consumer feedback is vital to organizational success. Future improvements in analytical techniques, particularly those that incorporate textual data and sentiment analysis, will further strengthen the ability to link environmental features, fan perceptions, and behavioral outcomes. By establishing a foundation for using digital review data in sport management research, this study offers a pathway for ongoing exploration of the link between physical experiences and digital expression in modem sport consumption.

REFERENCES

Brochado, A., Brito, C., Bouchet, A., & Oliveira, F. S. (2021). Dimensions of football stadium and museum tour experiences: The case of Europe's most valuable brands. *Sustainability, 13*(12), 6602. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126602

Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet? *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 18*(1), 38-52. https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.10073

Karuppusamy, P., Raj, Y. C. L., Sanjaykumar, S., & Kozina, Z. (2025). Fan engagement and spectator experience in cricket matches: A comprehensive study. *Health Sport Rehabilitation, 11*(2), 62–71. https://doi.org/10.58962/hsr.2025.11.2.62-71

Leite, É. (2023). From broadcasting to immersive experience: How commercial innovation and data intelligence are transforming sports and media globally. *International Seven Journal of Multidisciplinary, 2*(1). https://doi.org/10.56238/isevmjv2n1-023

Liu, S., & Huang, W. (2022). Study on the influence of network factors on the loyalty and emotional behavior of Chinese professional football club fans. *The International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology, 25*(Supplement 1), A78–A79. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyac032.107

Mehrabian, A., & Russell, J. A. (1974). *An approach to environmental psychology.* MIT Press.

Tanaka, E. (2021). A structural analysis of loyalty in professional baseball. *Japan Marketing Review, 2*(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.7222/marketingreview.2021.001

Wakefield, K. L., & Sloan, H. J. (1995). The effects of team loyalty and selected stadium factors on spectator attendance. *Journal of Sport Management, 9*(2), 153-172. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.9.2.153

Google Reviews. (2025). *Acrisure Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from

https://www.google.com/search?q=Acrisure+Stadium+reviews+Pittsburgh+PA

Google Reviews. (2025). *Allegiant Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Allegiant+Stadium+reviews+Las+Vegas+NV

Google Reviews. (2025). *AT&T Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=AT%26T+Stadium+reviews+Arlington+TX

Google Reviews. (2025). *Bank of America Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Bank+of+America+Stadium+reviews+Charlotte+NC

Google Reviews. (2025). *Caesars Superdome.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Caesars+Superdome+reviews+New+Orleans+LA

Google Reviews. (2025). *Cleveland Browns Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Cleveland+Browns+Stadium+reviews+Cleveland+O

Google Reviews. (2025). *Empower Field at Mile High*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Empower+Field+at+Mile+High+reviews+Denver+C

Google Reviews. (2025). *EverBank Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=EverBank+Stadium+reviews+Jacksonville+FL

Google Reviews. (2025). *FedExField.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=FedExField+reviews+Landover+MD

Google Reviews. (2025). *Ford Field.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Ford+Field+reviews+Detroit+MI

Google Reviews. (2025). *GEHA Field at Arrowhead Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=GEHA+Field+at+Arrowhead+Stadium+reviews+Kansas+City+MO

Google Reviews. (2025). *Gillette Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Gillette+Stadium+reviews+Foxborough+MA

Google Reviews. (2025). *Hard Rock Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Hard+Rock+Stadium+reviews+Miami+Gardens+FL

Google Reviews. (2025). *Highmark Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Highmark+Stadium+reviews+Orchard+Park+NY

Google Reviews. (2025). *Lambeau Field.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Lambeau+Field+reviews+Green+Bay+WI

Google Reviews. (2025). *Levi's Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Levi%27s+Stadium+reviews+Santa+Clara+CA

Google Reviews. (2025). *Lincoln Financial Field.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Lincoln+Financial+Field+reviews+Philadelphia+PA

Google Reviews. (2025). *Lucas Oil Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Lucas+Oil+Stadium+reviews+Indianapolis+IN

Google Reviews. (2025). *Lumen Field.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Lumen+Field+reviews+Seattle+WA

Google Reviews. (2025). *M&T Bank Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=M%26T+Bank+Stadium+reviews+Baltimore+MD

Google Reviews. (2025). *Mercedes-Benz Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Mercedes+Benz+Stadium+reviews+Atlanta+GA

Google Reviews. (2025). *MetLife Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=MetLife+Stadium+reviews+East+Rutherford+NJ

Google Reviews. (2025). *Nissan Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Nissan+Stadium+reviews+Nashville+TN

Google Reviews. (2025). *NRG Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from

https://www.google.com/search?q=NRG+Stadium+reviews+Houston+TX

Google Reviews. (2025). *Paycor Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Paycor+Stadium+reviews+Cincinnati+OH

Google Reviews. (2025). *Raymond James Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Raymond+James+Stadium+reviews+Tampa+FL

Google Reviews. (2025). *SoFi Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=SoFi+Stadium+reviews+Inglewood+CA

Google Reviews. (2025). *Soldier Field.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=Soldier+Field+reviews+Chicago+IL

Google Reviews. (2025). *State Farm Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=State+Farm+Stadium+reviews+Glendale+AZ

Google Reviews. (2025*). U.S. Bank Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=US+Bank+Stadium+reviews+Minneapolis+MN

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Acrisure Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Acrisure%20Stadium%20Pittsburgh%20Pennsylvania

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Allegiant Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Allegiant%20Stadium%20Las%20Vegas%20Nevada

Tripadvisor. (2025). *AT&T Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=AT%26T%20Stadium%20Arlington%20Texas

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Bank of America Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Bank%20of%20America%20Stadium%20Charlotte%20North%20Carolina

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Caesars Superdome*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Superdome%20New%20Orleans%20Louisiana

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Cleveland Browns Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Cleveland%20Browns%20Stadium%20Cleveland%20Ohio

Tripadvisor. (2025). *FedEx Field.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=FedExField%20Landover%20Maryland

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Ford Field.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Ford%20Field%20Detroit%20Michigan

Tripadvisor. (2025). *GEHA Field at Arrowhead Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Arrowhead%20Stadium%20Kansas%20City%20Missouri

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Gillette Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Gillette%20Stadium%20Foxborough%20Massachusetts

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Hard Rock Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Hard%20Rock%20Stadium%20Miami%20Gardens%20Florida

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Highmark Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Highmark%20Stadium%20Orchard%20Park%20New%20York

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Lambeau Field*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Lambeau%20Field%20Green%20Bay%20Wisconsin

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Levi's Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Levi%27s%20Stadium%20Santa%20Clara%20California

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Lincoln Financial Field*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Lincoln%20Financial%20Field%20Philadelphia%20Pennsylvania

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Lucas Oil Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Lucas%20Oil%20Stadium%20Indianapolis%20Indiana

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Lumen Field*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Lumen%20Field%20Seattle%20Washington

Tripadvisor. (2025). *M&T Bank Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=M%26T%20Bank%20Stadium%20Baltimore%20Maryland

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Mercedes-Benz Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Mercedes%20Benz%20Stadium%20Atlanta%20Georgia

Tripadvisor. (2025). *MetLife Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=MetLife%20Stadium%20East%20Rutherford%20New%20Jersey

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Nissan Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Nissan%20Stadium%20Nashville%20Tennessee

Tripadvisor. (2025). *NRG Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=NRG%20Stadium%20Houston%20Texas

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Paycor Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Paycor%20Stadium%20Cincinnati%20Ohio

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Raymond James Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Raymond%20James%20Stadium%20Tampa%20Florida

Tripadvisor. (2025). *SoFi Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=SoFi%20Stadium%20Inglewood%20California

Tripadvisor. (2025). *Soldier Field*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=Soldier%20Field%20Chicago%20Illinois

Tripadvisor. (2025). *State Farm Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=State%20Farm%20Stadium%20Glendale%20Arizona

Tripadvisor. (2025). *U.S. Bank Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.tripadvisor.com/Search?q=US%20Bank%20Stadium%20Minneapolis%20Minnesota

Yelp. (2025). *Acrisure Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Acrisure+Stadium&find_loc=Pittsburgh%2C+PA

Yelp. (2025). *Allegiant Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Allegiant+Stadium&find_loc=Las+Vegas%2C+NV

Yelp. (2025). *AT&T Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=AT%26T+Stadium&find_loc=Arlington%2C+TX

Yelp. (2025). *Bank of America Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Bank+of+America+Stadium&find_loc=Charlotte%2C+NC

Yelp. (2025). *Caesars Superdome*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Caesars+Superdome&find_loc=New+Orleans%2C+LA

Yelp. (2025). *Cleveland Browns Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Cleveland+Browns+Stadium&find_loc=Cleveland%2C+OH

Yelp. (2025). *EverBank Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=EverBank+Stadium&find_loc=Jacksonville%2C+FL

Yelp. (2025). *FedExField*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=FedExField&find_loc=Landover%2C+MD

Yelp. (2025). *Ford Field*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Ford+Field&find_loc=Detroit%2C+MI

Yelp. (2025). *GEHA Field at Arrowhead Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Arrowhead+Stadium&find_loc=Kansas+City%2C+MO

Yelp. (2025). *Gillette Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Gillette+Stadium&find_loc=Foxborough%2C+MA

Yelp. (2025). *Hard Rock Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Hard+Rock+Stadium&find_loc=Miami+Gardens%2C+FL

Yelp. (2025). *Highmark Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Highmark+Stadium&find_loc=Orchard+Park%2C+NY

Yelp. (2025). *Lambeau Field*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Lambeau+Field&find_loc=Green+Bay%2C+WI

Yelp. (2025). *Levi's Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Levi%27s+Stadium&find_loc=Santa+Clara%2C+CA

Yelp. (2025). *Lincoln Financial Field.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Lincoln+Financial+Field&find_loc=Philadelphia%2C+PA

Yelp. (2025). *Lucas Oil Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Lucas+Oil+Stadium&find_loc=Indianapolis%2C+IN

Yelp. (2025). *Lumen Field.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Lumen+Field&find_loc=Seattle%2C+WA

Yelp. (2025). *M&T Bank Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=M%26T+Bank+Stadium&find_loc=Baltimore%2C+MD

Yelp. (2025). *Mercedes-Benz Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Mercedes+Benz+Stadium&find_loc=Atlanta%2C+GA

Yelp. (2025). *MetLife Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=MetLife+Stadium&find_loc=East+Rutherford%2C+NJ

Yelp. (2025). *Nissan Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Nissan+Stadium&find_loc=Nashville%2C+TN

Yelp. (2025). *NRG Stadium*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=NRG+Stadium&find_loc=Houston%2C+TX

Yelp. (2025). *Paycor Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Paycor+Stadium&find_loc=Cincinnati%2C+OH

Yelp. (2025). *Raymond James Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Raymond+James+Stadium&find_loc=Tampa%2C+FL

Yelp. (2025). *SoFi Stadium*. Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=SoFi+Stadium&find_loc=Inglewood%2C+CA

Yelp. (2025). *Soldier Field*. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=Soldier+Field&find_loc=Chicago%2C+IL

Yelp. (2025). *State Farm Stadium.* Retrieved October 9, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=State+Farm+Stadium&find_loc=Glendale%2C+AZ

Yelp. (2025). *U.S. Bank Stadium.* Retrieved October 8, 2025, from https://www.yelp.com/search?find_desc=US+Bank+Stadium&find_loc=Minneapolis%2C+MN

APPENDIX

Table 4.

NFL Stadium Ratings

Stadium	Seating Capacity	Yelp Rating	TripAdvisor Rating	Google Rating	NFL Team
Acrisure Stadium (Pittsburgh, PA)	68,400	4.3* (238)	4.6* (2,407)	4.7* (14,257)	Home of the Pittsburgh Steelers
Allegiant Stadium (Las Vegas, NV)	65,000	3.5* (759)	4.0* (120)	4.7* (16,000)	Home of the Las Vegas Raiders
AT&T Stadium (Arlington, TX)	80,000 (expandable to 105,000)	4.0* (833)	4.6* (4,051)	4.7* (44,481)	Home of the Dallas Cowboys
Bank of America Stadium (Charlotte, NC)	74,867	3.9* (218)	4.4* (1,058)	4.6* (10,415)	Home of the Carolina Panthers
Caesars Superdome (New Orleans, LA)	73,208	4.0* (346)	4.3* (1,093)	4.6* (13,671)	Historic home of the New Orleans Saints
Cleveland Browns Stadium (Cleveland, OH)	67,895	3.5* (128)	4.1* (395)	4.5* (8,796)	Home of the Cleveland Browns
Empower Field at Mile High (Denver, CO)	76,125	4.2*(317)	4.5* (1,225)	4.6* (14,574)	Home of the Denver Broncos
EverBank Stadium (Jacksonville, FL)	67,814	4.0* (180)	4.3* (528)	4.5* (9,811)	Home of the Jacksonville Jaguars
Northwest Stadium/ Commanders Field (Washington, DC)	67,617	2.4* (379)	3.3* (371)	4.0* (7,794)	Home of the Washington Commander

					s
Ford Field (Detroit, MI)	65,000	4.0* (223)	4.4* (893)	4.6* (15,437)	Home of the Detroit Lions
GEHA Field at Arrowhead Stadium (Kansas City, MO)	76,416	4.0* (239)	4.5* (863)	4.7* (16,000)	Home of the Kansas City Chiefs
Gillette Stadium (Foxborough, MA)	65,878	3.4* (403)	4.3* (873)	4.6* (12,915)	Home of the New England Patriots
Hard Rock Stadium (Miami Gardens, FL)	65,326	3.3* (553)	4.1* (430)	4.6* (19,549)	Home of the Miami Dolphins
Highmark Stadium (Orchard Park, NY)	71,608	3.7* (147)	4.0* (260)	4.5* (8,504)	Home of the Buffalo Bills
Lambeau Field (Green Bay, WI)	81,441	4.8* (397)	4.8* (3,563)	4.8* (21,445)	Historic home of the Green Bay Packers
Levi's Stadium (Santa Clara, CA)	68,500	2.7* (1,731)	4.2* (1,000)	4.4* (12,873)	Home of the San Fransico 49ers
Lincoln Financial Field (Philadelphia, PA)	69,796	3.7* (266)	4.1* (439)	4.6* (13,782)	Home of the Philadelphia Eagles
Lucas Oil Stadium (Indianapolis, IN)	70,000	4.4* (323)	4.6* (1,636)	4.7* (13,816)	Home of the Indianapolis Colts
Lumen Field (Seattle, WA)	68,740	4.1* (552)	4.5* (1,305)	4.6* (18,524)	Home of the Seatle Seahawks
M&T Bank Stadium (Baltimore, MD)	71,008	4.0* (170)	4.5* (548)	4.7* (9,076)	Home of the Baltimore

					Ravens
Mercedes-Benz Stadium (Atlanta, GA)	71,000	4.1* (452)	4.3* (820)	4.7* (34,407)	Home of the Atlanta Falcons
MetLife Stadium (East Rutherford, NJ)	82,500	3.3* (650)	4.2* (1,075)	4.5* (26,253)	Home of the New York Giants and Jets
Nissan Stadium (Nashville, TN)	69,143	3.6* (223)	4.2* (704)	4.5* (12,236)	Home of the Tennessee Titans
NRG Stadium (Houston, TX)	72,220	3.6* (376)	4.3* (878)	4.6* (27,853)	Home of the Houston Texans.
Paycor Stadium (Cincinnati, OH)	65,515	3.5* (152)	**4.1*** (369)	4.4* (7,908)	Home of the Cincinnati Bengals
Raymond James Stadium (Tampa, FL)	69,218	3.6* (307)	4.2* (1,148)	4.5* (12,019)	Home of the Tampa Bay Buccaneers
SoFi Stadium (Inglewood, CA)	70,240	2.9* (1,270)	3.0* (147)	4.6* (21,000)	Home of the Los Angelas Rams and Chargers
Soldier Field (Chicago, IL)	61,500	3.6* (503)	4.1* (953)	4.5* (14,845)	Home of the Chicago Bears.
State Farm Stadium (Glendale, AZ)	63,400	3.5* (503)	4.4* (905)	4.6* (16,410)	Home of the Arizona Cardinals
U.S. Bank Stadium (Minneapolis, MN)	66,860	3.6* (200)	4.3* (710)	4.7* (21,204)	Home of the Minnesota Vikings

Table 5.

NFL Stadium Names and Opening Dates

Stadium	City/ Team	Year Opened
Acrisure Stadium (formerly Heinz Field)	Pittsburgh Steelers	2001
Allegiant Stadium	Las Vegas Raiders	2020
AT&T Stadium	Dallas Cowboys	2009
Bank of America Stadium	Carolina Panthers	1996
Caesars Superdome	New Orleans Saints	1975
Cleveland Browns Stadium (formerly FirstEnergy Stadium)	Cleveland Browns	1999
Empower Field at Mile High	Denver Broncos	2001
EverBank Stadium (formerly TIAA Bank Field)	Jacksonville Jaguars	1995
Commanders Field (formerly FedEx Field)	Washington Commanders	1997
Ford Field	Detroit Lions	2002
GEHA Field at Arrowhead Stadium	Kansas City Chiefs	1972
Gillette Stadium	New England Patriots	2002
Hard Rock Stadium (originally Joe Robbie Stadium)	Miami Dolphins	1987
Highmark Stadium (formerly Ralph Wilson Stadium)	Buffalo Bills	1973
Lambeau Field	Green Bay Packers	1957
Levi's Stadium	San Francisco 49ers	2014
Lincoln Financial Field	Philadelphia Eagles	2003
Lucas Oil Stadium	Indianapolis Colts	2008
Lumen Field (formerly CenturyLink Field)	Seattle Seahawks	2002
M&T Bank Stadium	Baltimore Ravens	1998
Mercedes-Benz Stadium	Atlanta Falcons	2017
MetLife Stadium	NY Giants / NY Jets	2010
Nissan Stadium	Tennessee Titans	1999
NRG Stadium	Houston Texans	2002
Paycor Stadium (formerly Paul Brown Stadium)	Cincinnati Bengals	2000

Raymond James Stadium	Tampa Bay Buccaneers	1998
SoFi Stadium	LA Rams / LA Chargers	2020
Soldier Field (renovated 2003, originally 1924)	Chicago Bears	1924
State Farm Stadium	Arizona Cardinals	2006
U.S. Bank Stadium	Minnesota Vikings	2016

Table 6.

Legacy vs. New-Generation Stadium Classification

Category	Stadium	Team (Primary Tenant)	Year Opened
Legacy Venues (Opened Before 2000)	Lambeau Field	Green Bay Packers	1957
	GEHA Field at Arrowhead Stadium	Kansas City Chiefs	1972
	Highmark Stadium	Buffalo Bills	1973
	Caesars Superdome	New Orleans Saints	1975
	Soldier Field	Chicago Bears	1924 (renovated 2003)
	EverBank Stadium	Jacksonville Jaguars	1995
	Bank of America Stadium	Carolina Panthers	1996
	Commanders Field	Washington Commanders	1997
	Raymond James Stadium	Tampa Bay Buccaneers	1998
	M&T Bank Stadium	Baltimore Ravens	1998
	Cleveland Browns Stadium	Cleveland Browns	1999
	Nissan Stadium	Tennessee Titans	1999
New-Generation Venues (Opened 2000 or Later)	Paycor Stadium	Cincinnati Bengals	2000
	Acrisure Stadium	Pittsburgh Steelers	2001
	Empower Field at Mile High	Denver Broncos	2001
	Gillette Stadium	New England	2002

	Patriots	
Ford Field	Detroit Lions	2002
Lumen Field	Seattle Seahawks	2002
Lincoln Financial Field	Philadelphia Eagles	2003
State Farm Stadium	Arizona Cardinals	2006
Lucas Oil Stadium	Indianapolis Colts	2008
AT&T Stadium	Dallas Cowboys	2009
MetLife Stadium	NY Giants / NY Jets	2010
Levi's Stadium	San Francisco 49ers	2014
U.S. Bank Stadium	Minnesota Vikings	2016
Mercedes-Benz Stadium	Atlanta Falcons	2017
Allegiant Stadium	Las Vegas Raiders	2020
SoFi Stadium	LA Rams/LA Chargers	2020
NRG Stadium	Houston Texans	2002