

Investigating the satisfaction of active event sport tourists

Marko Perić¹ and Ana Čuić Tanković^{2*}

¹ Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, University of Rijeka, Croatia. E-mail: markop@fthm.hr

² Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, University of Rijeka, Croatia. E-mail: anact@fthm.hr

* Corresponding author

Abstract

Active event sport tourists (AESTs) are those tourists who are taking part in organised events as competitors. Each event is held in a particular destination and, as a part of a highly competitive industry, both events and destinations offer an ever-widening range of services, striving to make their visitors satisfied. In order to better understand, conceptualize and manage the AESTs' satisfaction, the primary research based on a questionnaire survey was conducted on 16 small-scale sports events, collecting 502 responses. Results indicate that six satisfaction categories emerged: four event-related dimensions (staff and communication, event reputation, safety, and facilities and key processes) and two destination-related dimensions (destination offering and destination attributes). Understanding the role of the satisfaction of AESTs in a small-scale sport event creates both scientific and practical contributions, where sport event management and marketing need to consider each of these satisfaction categories in order to design and deliver the best active sport tourism experience.

Keywords: Satisfaction; Active event sport tourists; Small-scale sport events; Event attributes; Destination attributes

Citation: Perić, M. and Čuić Tanković, A. (2021). Investigating the satisfaction of active event sport tourists. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 28, 2806.



© 2021 The Author(s)

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Introduction

Sport tourism is a social phenomenon arising as a distinct interplay of activities, people and places at a certain time point (Getz, 2008; Weed & Bull, 2009). Although sport tourism participation could be individual and unstructured, travels to take part in or watch sport are mostly related to sport events (Ratten, 2011; Getz and Patterson, 2013). *Event sports tourism* (Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008; Weed & Bull, 2009) or *sport event tourism* (Alexandris & Kaplanidou, 2014; Getz & Page, 2016) is therefore at the forefront of the academics' and practitioners' interests as the most apparent demonstration of sport tourism (Deery, Jago & Fredline, 2004; Perić, Vitezić, & Đurkin Badurina, 2019). Although a large percentage of tourists visit sport events as spectators, active involvement in events is also acknowledged, especially in mass participation and outdoor events (Botella-Carrubi, Currás Móstoles, & Escrivá-Beltrán, 2019; Plunkett & Brooks, 2018; Ratten, 2019; Roche, Spake & Joseph, 2013; Scholtz, 2019). Consequently, tourists taking part in organised events as competitors can be classified as *active event sport tourists* – AESTs (Buning & Gibson, 2015, 2016a; Kaplanidou & Gibson, 2010; Perić, Đurkin, Vitezić, 2018).

For AESTs, the central motivation for attending a sport event is the event itself. However, the event does not exist in a vacuum and the connection between sport events and destinations has been previously researched, where hosting sport events has been identified as a managerial and marketing strategy for enhancing destination attractiveness and development (Bazzanella, Peters, & Schnitzer, 2019; Filo, Chen, King & Funk, 2013; Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007; Kirkup & Sutherland, 2017; Portugal, Campos, Martins, & Melo, 2017; Yuksel, Yuksel & Bilim, 2010). On the other hand, for sport events and destinations to be sustainable over time (i.e. to ensure revisit and viable financial flow), it is crucial that all participants are content with the overall offering.

Participant's satisfaction is considered a key criterion for appraising services (Yoshida & James, 2011). Satisfaction of sport event participants, however, is a common topic for academics in the field of sport management and marketing. To date, previous researches have extensively investigated the satisfaction of spectators, while the active participants' satisfaction represents an underinvestigated research area, especially in small-scale sport event settings (Mouratidis, Doumi, & Thanopoulos, 2020). However, not only is there a difference between active and passive participants' satisfaction, but there are also various approaches in measuring the participants' satisfaction (e.g. Alexandris, Theodorakis, Kaplanidou & Papadimitriou, 2017; Du, Jordan & Funk, 2015; Ko & Pastore, 2005; Shonk, Bravo, Velez-Colon & Lee, 2017; Theodorakis, Kaplanidou, Alexandris & Papadimitriou, 2019). These studies examined participants' personal judgment of events' services and overall context, but were limited by the events themselves while neglecting the broader context of destinations where the events have been held. Hence, as argued by Romo, Chinchilla and García (2010) and Yoshida (2017), further research on sport event satisfaction as well as on its determinants is needed.

This paper focuses on the satisfaction of AESTs, as the prominent part of overall sport event demand. Knowing the main dimensions of AESTs' satisfaction is of the utmost importance for event organisers who can then focus on key attributes when planning, marketing and delivering their events. With regard to this understudied field of interest and in order to fill the mentioned research gaps, the novelty of this paper is the development of a framework for investigating the key factors affecting AEST satisfaction, adding the destination dimension within the small-scale sport event context.

The next section reviews the literature on tourist satisfaction with special focus on the sport tourism event context. The third section describes the methodology implemented in the empirical study while

the fourth chapter presents the results. The paper finishes with a discussion and some concluding remarks and implications.

Theoretical background on AESTs' satisfaction

Travel and tourism industry finds a satisfied tourist of utmost importance for its viability (Gallarza, Gil-Saura, & Arteaga-Moreno, 2017). Satisfied tourists spend more, are more likely to revisit and recommend a venue to others (Muskat, Hörtnagl, Prayag, & Wagner, 2019; Plunkett & Brooks, 2017; Prayag, Hosany, Muskat, & Del Chiappa, 2017). However, customer satisfaction, which is very individualised construct, is crucial when evaluating services and has therefore often been studied in direct relation to service quality (Yoshida & James, 2011). Service quality is one of the major factors influencing the profitability of an organization, and service quality can affect consumer satisfaction, loyalty and retention (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988; Tsuji, Bennett, & Zhang, 2007). Researches have underlined the linkage between service quality and satisfaction, and between satisfaction and organizational success (Kotler, 2003; Anderson & Sullivan, 1993, Fornell, 1992). Oliver (1980) examined consumer satisfaction or dissatisfaction as a balance of consumers' feelings of perceived performance of a service versus their expectations. Madrigal (1995) investigated the consumer's satisfaction in the sport setting and found that core service quality contributes to satisfaction. In other words, the perception of performance regarding service quality can be considered crucial for their experience and satisfaction (which is usually operationalised as overall satisfaction).

There is a range of approaches and models that have potential to clarify management's evaluation of the difficulties in achieving service quality, as a predecessor of consumer satisfaction (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Shonk & Chelladurai, 2009) in a sport-tourism context (e.g. Alexandris *et al.*, 2017; Chelladurai & Chang, 2000; Donne, 2009; Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008, 2009; Thwaites & Chadwick, 2005; Thwaites, 1999; Tsitskari, Tsiotras & Tsiotras, 2006; Yeh, Hua, & Huang, 2016; Yoshida & James, 2011). Emphasis is placed on understanding the multiple facets and intricacies of attaining service quality in a sports tourism context. Although dimensions of service quality may differ among countries and different service sectors (Tsitskari *et al.*, 2006), some dimensions, such as access quality, contest quality, outcome quality, interaction quality, and physical environment quality seem to be more important for sport event spectators (Afshari, Hosseinabadi, & Rohany, 2019; Ko & Pastore, 2005; Ko, Zhang, Cattani, & Pastore, 2011; Mouratidis, Doumi, & Thanopoulos, 2020; Shonk, Bravo, Velez-Colon, & Lee, 2017; Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008, 2009; Tsuji, Bennett, & Zhang, 2007; Yoshida & James, 2011).

While previous studies have focused on spectators, other studies have centred on service quality from the perspective of AESTs. Since SERQUAL measurement scale is found to be inappropriate for an outdoor sport tourism context (Kouthouris & Alexandris, 2005; Donne, 2009), academics used alternative scales, for instance the ADVENTUREQUAL (Donne, 2009), SERVPERF (Lee, Kim, Ko & Sagas, 2011) or PSEASD – Participant Sport Event Attribute and Service Delivery (Du *et al.*, 2015). Similarly to spectators, AESTs in most cases found event physical attributes and operations related to facility/program/interaction/information quality, as well as outcome quality strongly determined satisfaction of AESTs (Alexandris *et al.*, 2017; Donne, 2009; Du *et al.*, 2015; Howat & Assaker, 2013; Kouthouris & Alexandris, 2005; Lee *et al.*, 2011; Theodorakis *et al.*, 2019; Yeh *et al.*, 2016). These studies have proven that the sport event evaluation in terms of quality and satisfaction are inter-related and that, if service quality improved, satisfaction and frequency of attending the particular sport event would increase (Alexandris *et al.*, 2017; Yeh *et al.*, 2016) as well as participants' quality of life (Theodorakis *et al.*, 2019).

What these studies have in common is the heterogeneity of service quality that leads to an inconsistency in methodology for measuring participants' satisfaction and sports tourism quality. Many authors have suggested the need for gain more insight on the factors that affect customer satisfaction and comprehensive approaches on quality management within sports tourism (Kouthouris & Alexandris, 2005; Romo *et al.*, 2010; Tsitskari *et al.*, 2006; Yoshida, 2017). While physical environment dimension is found to be significant in shaping the perceived quality, which further influence overall satisfaction, it usually refers to sport facility, event atmosphere or entertainment program. In other words, the scope of the environment dimension does not go beyond the event itself thus leaving destination attributes omitted from examining the AESTs' satisfaction.

There is no doubt that, while being a part of the event, AESTs absorb and merge into the event setting and subjectively interpret their own active participation in sport activity within such setting (Brochado, Stoleriu & Lupu, 2018; Chen & Funk, 2010; Funk, 2017; Hallmann, Feiler, Müller, & Breuer, 2012; Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2010; Klaus & Maklan, 2011; Mirehie & Gibson, 2020; Saayman & Saayman, 2012; Shipway & Fyall, 2012; Stienmetz, Kim, Xiang, & Fesenmaier, 2020; Theodorakis *et al.*, 2019; Yoshida, 2017). In addition to the individual behaviours of AESTs (personal motivation and individual choices), these interpretations depend on event infrastructure and organisation as well as supportive destination attributes that could be identified as the underlying elements of a sport event's business model contributing to value creation, value delivery and overall satisfaction of AESTs (Perić, Wise & Dragičević, 2017). Indeed, there is a rising need to cross traditional firms' (i.e. events') boundaries and to include destination into organisations' business models (Ratten, 2019; Reinhold, Zach, & Krizaj, 2019). The importance of the destination has been further identified as "place dependence" or functional attachment when visitors appreciate its unique settings (Anderson & Fulton, 2008; Harmon, Zinn & Gleason, 2005). Therefore, sport events operate in an environment which is becoming increasingly complex given the rise of visitors (Intel, 2014) and destination marketers need to increasingly try to leverage destination attributes, especially the long-term benefits that remain after hosting events. It is therefore argued that it is necessary to go beyond sport tourists' initial motivation to visit the event, and to further investigate the secondary-level relationship between tourist's personal identity and a natural setting (i.e. a destination and/or an event) which can result in increased place attachment, event attachment, satisfaction and revisit intentions (Filo, Chen, King, & Funk, 2013; Kaplanidou & Gibson, 2010; Kirkup & Sutherland, 2017; Tsai, 2012). It follows that a consumer's overall satisfaction with an event and/or trip will depend upon the level to which her/his expectations regarding distinctive event and destination attributes are met (see Nghiêm-Phú, 2017).

AESTs (as well as spectators) are capable to distinguish between the event and destination attributes when taking part in an event and assessing their future loyalty (Kruger & Viljoen, 2019; Plunkett & Brooks, 2018). The importance of some event and destination attributes for AESTs was explored by Buning and Gibson (2016a, 2016b), Getz and McConnell (2011, 2014), Kulczycki and Halpenny (2014), Newland and Aicher (2018) and Perić *et al.* (2019) but AESTs' satisfaction with particular attributes was not the issue in these studies. This paper therefore proposes new insights on the measurement of AEST satisfaction by including destination-related attributes in analysing small-scale sport events, which are congruent with the main principles of sustainable tourism and have distinct advantages compatible with the host destination (Bazzanella *et al.*, 2020; Gibson, Kaplanidou & Kang, 2012; Kaplanidou & Gibson, 2010; Mouratidis *et al.*, 2020).

Methodology

Questionnaire development

In order to fulfil the research goals, primary research using a self-administered questionnaire was conducted. The questionnaire consisted of five closed questions about socio-economic and demographic details and elements regarding satisfaction with event and destination attributes, based on the current literature (Buning & Gibson, 2016a; Getz & McConnell, 2014; Kaplanidou & Gibson, 2010; Ko *et al.*, 2011; Soita, 2012). A pilot study involving a focus group with six event organisers, sports and tourism managers was organised to purify the initial set of 54 items, to revise and/or propose new items if appropriate. The focus group participants assessed each of the proposed items based on their relevance, the items were ranked and the final list of items is reached with a consensus. Finally, the questionnaire employed in the research comprised 36 items, adapted and operationalized to the novelty of the research, using a five-point Likert type scale where 1 = 'not at all satisfied' and 5 = 'extremely satisfied'. According to the internationality of the events studied, the questionnaire was prepared in English and translated into Croatian, Italian and Slovenian by authorized translators.

Data collection and analysis

The research applied a quantitative approach. For data collection, a questionnaire-based survey is used. Data were collected from September 2016 to April 2017 in Slovenia and Croatia. The research sample was selected from a population of AESTs attending 16 selected sport events: seven mountain biking events, three trail running, four sport fishing and two cross-country skiing events (see Appendix 1). While these events are partly heterogeneous (belong to different sports), the common features for all of them are their small-scale size as well as outdoor and nature-based activity. Accordingly, it would be very difficult to gather adequate number of respondents for further analysis if events were approached separately.

The on-site research was based on the availability and willingness of participants to complete the questionnaire. Approaching the respondents at the end of the events, the author asked a screening question to all respondents, whether they had actively participated in the sports event. Those who answered positively and agreed to fill in the questionnaire were then given a questionnaire to complete after the competition, during the joint lunch. In total, 502 completed and valid questionnaires were collected, with a response rate of 19.93 per cent.

Descriptive analysis was used to explain the sample profile. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and the reliability tests were used to further refine the research instrument and explore the dimensionality of the constructs.

Results

Sample

The first step of data analysis provided a descriptive profile which is presented in Table 1. The proportion of male respondents was slightly higher (67.3 per cent) than the share of female participants. The respondents were mostly from Croatia (60.96 per cent) and Slovenia (30.48 per cent), but also belonged to the following countries: Italy and Serbia (1 per cent), Poland and Denmark (0.6 per cent), the UK, Austria, Macedonia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia (0.4 per cent) and other countries (3.18 per cent). More than half the respondents were married (53.2 per cent) with children (53.8 per cent). The age distribution demonstrates that the average age is 38.5 years. The monthly net income level for the majority of respondents is lower than 1500 EUR.

Table 1. *Sample characteristics*

Measure and item		Percent
Gender	Male	67.3
	Female	32.7
Country of origin	Croatia	60.96
	Slovenia	30.48
	Italy	1
	Serbia	1
	Poland	0.6
	Denmark	0.6
	Uk	0.4
	Austria	0.4
	Macedonia	0.4
	Czech Republic	0.4
	Slovakia	0.4
	Other countries	3.18
Marital status	Married	53.2
	Not married	46.8
Children	Yes	53.8
	No	46.2
Monthly income	Lower than 500 EUR	13.5
	500-1000 EUR	38.4
	1001-1500 EUR	26.1
	1501-2000 EUR	14
	More than 2000 EUR	8

Mean ranking and normality test

The mean ranking of items shows that the AESTs are the most satisfied with variables related to destination and course scenery, destination safety and party atmosphere (Table 2). The indicator values of Skewness and Kurtosis are between -2 and +2 which are considered acceptable to prove normal univariate distribution (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014), except for the Kurtosis values of the items “The destination is scenic” (2.128) and “A scenic and interesting course” (3.082), indicating a positive “heavy-tailed” distribution, which can be justified accordingly to the purpose of the study, which is investigating satisfaction.

Principal component analysis

The principal component analysis (PCA) is used to group variables that are highly correlated into principal components. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is 0.911 (considered “marvellous”) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity indicated the Chi-square value of each factor achieved the marked level (6387.518; $p=0.000$). These two tests supported the suitability of data for this analysis. One item was excluded because its factor loading was below 0.3 (Burns & Burns, 2008), and a clear factor structure was revealed by eight factors with eigenvalues greater than one. The communalities are above 0.4 as indicated by Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson (2010). However, the reliability test is calculated with Cronbach’s alpha and Composite reliability. These tests delineated a good internal consistency for all the factors, except for two factors (‘purchasing and sustainability’ and ‘course’), which are therefore eliminated from the further analysis and discussion. Table 3 presents the results of the exploratory factor analysis with six retained factors with eigenvalues greater than one, which accounted for 50.634 per cent of cumulative variance explained. The factor with the greatest

Table 2. Mean ranking and normality test

Rank	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
1	The destination is scenic	4.49	0.70	-1.409	2.128
2	A scenic and interesting course	4.35	0.77	-1.447	3.082
3	A party atmosphere surrounding the event	4.33	0.70	-0.779	0.183
4	The destination is a safe place to stay and visit	4.30	0.78	-1.094	1.257
5	Up-to-date information about the event	4.22	0.78	-0.817	0.528
6	Event safety	4.22	0.72	-0.930	1.796
7	All event-related information is communicated through website/social media	4.20	0.85	-0.957	0.749
8	The destination is easy to reach	4.18	0.81	-0.833	0.568
9	Skilled staff	4.18	0.76	-0.667	0.245
10	Signs help me to find my way around the event	4.18	0.84	-0.985	0.935
11	Staff give prompt answer/service to my demands	4.17	0.78	-0.770	0.532
12	Available parking area	4.12	0.85	-0.766	0.260
13	Efficient communication with the organiser prior to the event	4.12	0.77	-0.681	0.489
14	Course safety	4.11	0.75	-0.775	1.213
15	The expected weather conditions are favourable	4.09	0.90	-0.871	0.503
16	Proper implementation of environmental protection measures	4.07	0.85	-0.801	0.727
17	Proper implementation of security measures	4.05	0.83	-0.820	0.931
18	Quality of food and beverages at the event	4.04	0.91	-0.750	0.226
19	Supply of high-quality food in the destination	3.95	0.83	-0.506	-0.128
20	Supply of economical/budget accommodations in the destination	3.93	0.90	-0.651	0.288
21	Proper implementation of crowd control measures	3.92	0.89	-0.734	0.655
22	Supporting services such as toilet facilities etc.	3.90	0.97	-0.828	0.447
23	Components of social sustainability are included in event organisation (local community involvement, proceeds go to a "good cause"...)	3.84	0.88	-0.515	0.129
24	There are things to do in the area besides the event	3.83	0.90	-0.522	0.109
25	Skilled and competitive participants	3.82	0.88	-0.600	0.427
26	The reputation and prestige of the event	3.81	0.92	-0.630	0.290
27	A challenging course	3.79	0.91	-0.681	0.515
28	Participants receive prizes and gifts (money, medals, shirts, etc.)	3.76	0.98	-0.656	0.313
29	The area has activities for families	3.72	0.91	-0.349	-0.112
30	A course that makes it easy to get a good result	3.68	0.99	-0.504	-0.035
31	The larger the event, the better (many participants)	3.64	0.96	-0.327	-0.266
32	The event gets media coverage	3.61	0.95	-0.242	-0.262
33	Involvement of a major corporate sponsor(s)	3.60	0.99	-0.422	-0.068
34	A low entry/registration fee	3.58	1.06	-0.390	-0.371
35	Sport equipment and other merchandise available for purchase at the event	3.33	1.02	-0.241	-0.226
36	Supply of high category accommodation in the destination	3.30	1.02	-0.250	-0.066

variance explained, ‘staff and communication’, points out the satisfaction with and importance of the basic services focused on staff providing information to AESTs (e.g. “Skilled staff”, “Up-to-date information about the event”, “Staff give prompt answer/service to my demands”, etc.).

Table 3. *Principal component analysis*

Factors	Factor loading	Communalities	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite reliability	Eigenvalues	Variance Explained (per cent)
Factor 1: Staff and communication			0.805	0.7046	9.807	28.021
Skilled staff	0.665	0.581				
Up-to-date information about the event	0.661	0.549				
Staff give prompt answer/service to my demands	0.566	0.573				
Efficient communication with the organiser prior to the event	0.517	0.569				
Quality of food and beverages at the event	0.409	0.508				
All event-related information is communicated through website/social media	0.361	0.518				
Factor 2: Destination offering			0.802	0.8173	2.057	5.876
The area has activities for families	0.807	0.644				
There are things to do in the area besides the event	0.726	0.604				
Supply of high-quality food in the destination	0.678	0.627				
Supply of high category accommodation in the destination	0.621	0.605				
Supply of economical/budget accommodation in the destination	0.594	0.516				
Factor 3: Event reputation			0.734	0.7243	1.912	5.464
Skilled and competitive participants	0.661	0.620				
The larger the event, the better (many participants)	0.654	0.583				
The reputation and prestige of the event	0.648	0.562				
Involvement of a major corporate sponsor(s)	0.471	0.498				
A course that makes it easy to get a good result	0.444	0.466				
The event gets media coverage	0.414	0.537				
Factor 4: Destination attributes			0.725	0.7528	1.491	4.261
The destination is scenic	0.703	0.596				
The destination is easy to reach	0.655	0.642				
The destination is a safe place to stay and visit	0.641	0.568				
The expected weather conditions are favourable	0.630	0.508				
Factor 5: Safety			0.834	0.8611	1.400	4.001
Event safety	-0.884	0.815				
Course safety	-0.855	0.787				
Factor 6: Facilities and key processes			0.807	0.7047	1.054	3.011
Available parking area	0.759	0.660				
Supporting services such as toilet facilities	0.694	0.644				
Proper implementation of crowd control measures	0.550	0.593				
Proper implementation of security measures	0.469	0.625				
Proper implementation of environmental protection measures	0.383	0.648				
Signs help me to find my way around the event	0.304	0.548				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 19 iterations.

Discussion and concluding remarks

Results suggest that service quality in an active sports tourism environment is complex and multi-dimensional. However, two aggregated groups of attributes could be distinguished within the proposed sport event satisfaction measurement scale. First, there are four event-related dimensions of satisfaction, namely, 'staff and communication' (factor 1), 'event reputation' (factor 3), 'safety' (factor 5), and 'facilities and key processes' (factor 6). Second, there are two destination-related dimensions of satisfaction, namely, 'destination offering' (factor 2) and 'destination attributes' (factor 4).

Regarding event-related dimensions, this study confirmed that the quality of service strongly depends on skilled staff who keep AESTs informed (factor 1). This is not surprising because staff directly interact with AESTs and skilled, responsive and well-mannered staff is found to be a key factor for AESTs' experiences (Alexandris *et al.*, 2017; Donne, 2009; Du *et al.*, 2015; Howat & Assaker, 2013; Perić *et al.*, 2019). Availability of information on a user-friendly website is also important (Getz & McConnell, 2011, 2014). Event reputation (factor 3) is another satisfaction dimension of AESTs. It is supported by the social networking between many skilled participants as argued by Donne (2009) and Yoshida (2017) as well as the involvement of major corporate and media sponsors although corporate and media sponsors were not found highly important in specific mountain biking and trail running contexts (see Getz & McConnell, 2011, 2014). As expected, event and course safety (factor 5) emerged as an AEST satisfaction dimension. In addition to safety being one of the most salient decision-making facets for many tourists (Ghaderi, Saboori, & Khoshkam, 2017), active sport tourism also implies more risks related to injuries. The safety theme like course safety is therefore recognised by AESTs (see Buning & Gibson, 2016b; Hallmann, Kaplanidou, & Breur, 2010; Perić *et al.*, 2018) who may be more sensitive to safety issues than non-sport tourists (Chen & Funk, 2010; Roche *et al.*, 2013). The fourth event-related dimension (i.e. factor 6) refers to additional and ancillary services for AESTs that supplement the core sport product, such as parking areas, toilet facilities and signalization, which are found to be important attributes for both participant and spectator sports (Alexandris *et al.*, 2017; Ko *et al.*, 2011; Shonk *et al.*, 2017). Besides these supportive elements, this dimension also involves some processes like proper implementation of security, crowd control and environmental protection measures which are proved to be the key elements of the event business model (Hallmann *et al.*, 2010; Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2010; Perić *et al.*, 2018; 2019) and strongly contribute to the overall sport user experience (Funk, 2017).

Unlike event-related dimensions, destination-related attributes go beyond the limits and give a broader context of an individual sport event (Kaplanidou, Jordan, Funk, & Ridinger, 2012; Kruger & Viljoen, 2019; Portugal, Campos, Martins & Melo, 2017). Although in cases of unique and iconic sport events and high-level participants the destination area seems to be less important (Aicher & Newland, 2017; Getz & McConnell, 2011), many AESTs (and spectators too) still want to get familiar with the destination as a whole and enjoy in the different services it provides. Therefore, AEST satisfaction will depend on destination attributes (factor 4) which refer to destination safety, availability, scenery and weather conditions. Unsafe destinations will encounter problems in attracting tourists (Seabra, Dolnicar, Abrantes, & Kastenholz, 2013) and safety is an absolute precondition for successful tourism performance. The same is true for situational attributes like expected weather conditions in the destination, traffic availability of the destination and the destination landscapes which are evaluated by AESTs on a continuous basis, making them an important criterion when choosing between competing sport events and destinations (Buning & Gibson, 2016b; Getz & McConnell, 2011; Melo & Gomes, 2017). Interestingly, although weather conditions are beyond the control of the organiser, it seems that AESTs get used to and have no problem with bad weather conditions (Perić *et al.*, 2018) since competitions are rarely cancelled in such cases. In addition, AEST satisfaction will also depend on the destination offering (factor 2), which includes entertainment, food and beverages and accommodation services available in

the destination. These services are regularly analysed within a sport event context and, as argued by Getz and McConnell (2011), Mirehie and Gibson (2020), Newland and Aicher (2018) and Wäsche, Dickson and Woll (2013), are found decisive for the comprehensive sport tourism product. Since these services are usually beyond the control of event organisers, their provision can be effective only if a regional network of various stakeholders is in place (Wäsche *et al.*, 2013) thus expanding the event's business model reach.

To summarise, this study empirically investigates the satisfaction of active participants of sport tourism events, that is AESTs. The proposed scale consists of six dimensions, of which four are event-related and two are destination-related. The inclusion of destination-related attributes in measuring the satisfaction of AESTs is a methodological novelty which has made comparison with other quality and satisfaction scales more difficult. The four event-related dimensions proposed in this study (staff and communication, event reputation, safety, and facilities and key processes) include both tangible/physical and intangible aspects of the (event sport tourism) service (see also Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Kouthouris & Alexandris, 2005; Lee *et al.*, 2011). Also, these four dimensions cover the concepts of event quality and sport consumer quality as defined in previous studies. This means that the proposed dimensions refer to both core product and secondary services (Howat & Assaker, 2013; Shonk *et al.*, 2017; Tsuji *et al.*, 2007; Yoshida, 2017) as well as social networks and relationships with and between the customers (Donne, 2009; Ko & Pastore, 2005; Yeh *et al.*, 2016; Yoshida, 2017).

However, few items related to the course itself, which represents the core and the sportiest attribute of the event, did not enter the analysis. It is not only about the course aesthetics but also about the challenge associated with performance-oriented participants, although the attribute of challenge is found to be less important to AESTs than visual appeal (e.g. Getz & McConnell, 2014; Buning & Gibson, 2016a, 2016b; Perić *et al.*, 2019). The registration fee, which reflects directly the cost-benefit ratio for AESTs, should also be investigated in the future. On the other hand, purchasing possibilities at the event and party atmosphere are examples of such complimentary services, which are already recognised as important sport event attributes (Buning & Gibson, 2016a, 2016b; Getz & McConnell, 2011, 2014; Newland & Aicher, 2018; Yoshida, 2017) and event quality features (Alexandris *et al.*, 2017; Du *et al.*, 2015; Theodorakis *et al.*, 2019;), but also remained outside the measurement scale and in-depth analysis. Similarly, respecting the interest of the local community and the aim to involve locals are also proved to be key organisational issues for both small- and large-scale sport events (see Schulenkorf & Edwards, 2012; Zhang & Park, 2015; Perić *et al.*, 2019).

Still, the inclusion of destination-related attributes in the proposed measurement scale has further deepened the multidimensionality of sport consumer satisfaction. As argued before, it allows for a better apprehension of the sport experience and satisfaction concept in general. The inclusion of destination-related attributes therefore represents an innovative attempt for measuring AEST satisfaction thus contributing to the management and marketing theory. Instead of measuring satisfaction by a limited set of items as was the case in the most of similar studies that were examining service quality and participants' satisfaction at sport events, this study investigated the participants' satisfaction with a broad range of event and destination's attributes.

On the other hand, the conclusions and proposals of this paper are of great relevance for sport event practice. AESTs, who are performance oriented, are particularly responsive to the quality of a complex and sport-specific tourism product. Further, the interpretations of AESTs, as sport consumers, are directly dependent on the policies, procedures and processes of a sport organisation and broader sport context (Funk, 2017; Perić *et al.*, 2017). It follows that the tourists' evaluation of infrastructure, organisational, environmental and other attributes within the event as well as the destination should

be considered with full attention when developing sport tourism activities. It is therefore essential that sport event organisers as service providers consciously approach the issue of event business models and the value that AESTs are seeking. In other words, sport event organisers need to be familiar with AESTs' preferences towards and satisfaction with different attributes of the event they are organising as well as towards the whole destination where the event is taking place. Each attribute and dimension has an apparent place within the event's business model and event organisers can use this scale as a guideline to develop business and marketing strategies that will fit the existing demand of AESTs and to capture further benefits.

Despite the attempts to impartially analyse the selected literature on AESTs and to rigorously apply the selected methodology, this study comes with several limitations. While focusing on the satisfaction of AESTs, the perspective of spectators is neglected. Despite the fact that the selected sports (mountain biking, sport fishing, trail running, and cross-country skiing) are not viewed as typical spectator sports, first of all because of course characteristics, these sports still gather some audience watching the events. It is therefore expected that passive participants would assess the proposed attributes differently. Further, this study presumes that the dimensions of AEST satisfaction will be common for different types of sport events. An alternative approach, which would analyse the sports separately, could deliver different results. Also, sport tourism events gather participants who are differently motivated (e.g. to compete, to improve their skills, to socialize, to have fun, to enjoy the nature, to relax, etc.). Although competing does not necessarily have to be the primary focus of an event, the fact that the final ranking is important for some more competitively oriented participants should not be neglected. Thus, future research could consider also including the outcome of the core sport product (i.e. range of programs and mastering physical skills) which has to be distinguished from the outcome of the ancillary services (Yoshida, 2017). New studies also underline the importance of co-creation of the AEST's experience with the event and the destination, influencing the event and/or the destination loyalty (Yoo, Newland & Lee, 2020), which can be an interesting path for future researches. On the other hand, the information collected about the destination was limited to the sport event, with no tools to measure the AESTs' perception of the destination prior to attending the event. It should be recognized that the perceived destination image can be susceptible to several sources like promotional materials, social media, word-of-mouth, etc. Also, previous visits by AESTs over time have not been researched and it is difficult to divide any new information about the destination from previous experiences. Finally, the reliability test points to bad internal consistency of two factors and items related to the course features as well as purchasing and sustainability elements at the event need to be further investigated. Similarly, the total variance explained by extracted and retained factors is low and we can therefore speculate that there are other underlying dimensions that explain the participants' satisfaction. Therefore, this scale should be tested in future studies that would include AESTs from other individual and team sports in different contexts. Additional comparable results would probably contribute to a more refined cognition of various satisfaction dimensions and increase the generalisability of the scale. Hence, with regard to the post-trip process which can affect the satisfaction constructs, future research should adopt a control survey after the sport event is over and the AESTs return to their homes.

Appendix 1. List of events grouped by sport

Event	Sport	Place / Year	No. of participants	Sample size – valid questionnaires
Gorski Kotar Bike Tour	MTB	Gorski Kotar, Croatia / Jul 2016	30	11
Black Hole Marathon	MTB	Črna na Koroškem, Slovenia / Jul 2016	139	15
Kamenjak Mountain Bike Tour	MTB	Tršće, Gorski Kotar, Croatia / Aug 2016	26	11
Rekreatur 2016	MTB	Savinja and Šalek Valley, Slovenia / Aug 2016	100	34
Fužine2Sea	MTB	Fužine/Crikvenica, Croatia / Aug 2016	248	47
38 th Assault on Vršič	MTB	Kranjska Gora, Slovenia / Sep 2016	672	46
Downhill Lošinj	MTB	Veli Lošinj, Croatia / Apr 2017	121	42
Risnjak Trail	TR	Risnjak National Park Croatia / Jul 2016	399	63
Ogulin Trail	TR	Ogulin, Croatia / Sept 2016	178	44
Dalmacija Ultra Trail	TR	Omiš, Croatia / Oct 2016	349	58
3 rd Sakura UL Cup	SF	Mrzla vodica, Croatia / Sept 2016	40	23
Pike Masters II	SF	Orešje, Zagreb, Croatia / Oct 2016	40	21
3 rd Prologic “Carp Challenge Mrežnica 2016.”	SF	Duga Resa, Croatia / Nov 2016	20	10
Golden Trout 2017	SF	Čabar, Croatia 7 Apr 2017	42	20
Marathon Tamar	CCS	Rateče, Slovenia / Jan 2017	36	18
Pokljuka Marathon AS	CCS	Pokljuka, Slovenia / Mar 2017	78	39

Note: TR = Trail running; MTB = Mountain biking; SF = Sport fishing; CCS = Cross-country skiing.

References

- Afshari, S. M. M., Hosseinabadi, M. T., & Rohany, A. (2019). Assessment of sport tourists' satisfaction with the quality of facilities of Tehran Azadi sport complex. *Assessment*, 7(2), 5-12.
- Aicher, T. J., & Newland, B. L. (2017). To explore or race? Examining endurance athletes' destination event choices. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 24(4), 340-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766717736364>
- Alexandris, K., & Kaplanidou, K. (2014). Marketing sport event tourism: Sport tourist behaviors and destination provisions. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 23(3), 125-126, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060802629919>
- Alexandris, K., Theodorakis, N., Kaplanidou, K., & Papadimitriou, D. (2017). Event quality and loyalty among runners with different running involvement levels: The case of ‘The Alexander the Great’ International Marathon. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 8(3), 292-307. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-08-2016-0057>
- Anderson, D. H., & Fulton, D. C. (2008). Experience preferences as mediators of the wildlife related recreation participation: Place attachment relationship. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 13(2), 73-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10871200701669971>

- Anderson, E. W., & Sullivan, M. (1993). The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms. *Marketing Science*, 12, 125-143.
- Bazzanella, F., Peters, M., & Schnitzer, M. (2019). The perceptions of stakeholders in small-scale sporting events. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 20(4), 261-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15470148.2019.1640819>
- Botella-Carrubi, D., Currás Móstoles, R., & Escrivá-Beltrán, M. (2019). Penyagolosa Trails: From ancestral roads to sustainable ultra-trail race, between spirituality, nature, and sports. A case of study. *Sustainability*, 11(23), 6605. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11236605>
- Brochado, A., Stoleriu, O., & Lupu, C. (2018). Surf camp experiences. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 22(1), 21-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2018.1430609>
- Buning R. J. & Gibson H. (2015). The evolution of active-sport-event travel careers. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29(5), 555-569. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2014-0215>
- Buning R. J. & Gibson H. (2016a). Exploring the trajectory of active sport event travel careers: A social worlds perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(3), 265-281. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2015-0213>
- Buning R. J. & Gibson H. (2016b). The role of travel conditions in cycling tourism: Implications for destination and event management. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 20(3-4), 175-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2016.1155474>
- Burns, R. P., & Burns, R. A. (2008). *Business Research Methods and Statistics Using SPSS*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Chelladurai, P., & Chang, K. (2000). Targets and standards of quality in sport services. *Sports Management Review*, 3(1), 1-22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523\(00\)70077-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(00)70077-5)
- Chen, N., & Funk, D.C. (2010). Exploring destination image, experience and revisit intention: a comparison of sport and non-sport tourist perceptions. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 15(3), 39-259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2010.513148>
- Cronin, Jr. J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension. *The Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55-68. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252296>
- Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2004). Sport tourism or event tourism: are they one and the same? *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 9(3), 235-245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1477508042000320250>
- Donne, K. (2009). ADVENTUREQUAL: an extension of the SERVQUAL conceptual gap model in young people's outdoor adventure. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 6(3), 253-276. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSMM.2009.029088>
- Du, J., Jordan, J. S., & Funk, D. C. (2015). Managing mass sport participation: Adding a personal performance perspective to remodel antecedents and consequences of participant sport event satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29(6), 688-704. <https://doi.org/10.1123/JSM.2014-0225>
- Filo, K., Chen, N., King, C., & Funk, D. C. (2013). Sport tourists' involvement with a destination: a stage-based examination. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 37(1), 100-124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348011425496>
- Funk, D. C. (2017). Introducing a Sport Experience Design (SX) framework for sport consumer behavior research. *Sport Management Review*, 20(2), 145-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2016.11.006>
- Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, 29, 403-428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.07.017>
- Getz, D., & McConnell, A. (2011). Serious sport tourism and event travel careers. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25(4), 326-338. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.25.4.326>
- Getz, D., & McConnell, A. (2014). Comparing trail runners and mountain bikers: Motivation, involvement, portfolios, and event-tourist careers. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 15(1), 69-100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15470148.2013.834807>

- Getz, D., & Page, S. J. (2016). Progress and prospects for event tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 52, 593-631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.03.007>
- Getz, D., & Patterson, I. (2013). Social worlds as a framework for examining event and travel careers. *Tourism Analysis*, 18, 485-501. <https://doi.org/10.3727/108354213X13782245307632>
- Ghaderi, Z., Saboori, B., & Khoshkam, M. (2017). Does security matter in tourism demand? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(6), 552-565. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1161603>
- Gibson, H. J., Kaplanidou, K., & Kang, S. J. (2012). Small-scale event sport tourism: A case study in sustainable tourism. *Sport management review*, 15(2), 160-170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2011.08.013>
- Hallmann, K., Feiler, S., Müller, S., & Breuer, C. (2012). The interrelationship between sport activities and the perceived winter sport experience. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 17(2), 145-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2012.729905>
- Hallmann, K., Kaplanidou, K., & Breur, C. (2010). Event image perceptions among active and passive sport tourists at marathon races. *International Journal of Sport Marketing & Sponsorship*, 12(1), 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMSMS-12-01-2010-005>
- Harmon, L. K., Zinn, H. C., & Gleason, M. (2005). Place identity, place dependence, and place-based affect. In *George Wright Society conference proceedings*, 149-156, Hancock, MI: George Wright Society.
- Howat, G., & Assaker, G. (2013). The hierarchical effects of perceived quality on perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty: Empirical results from public, outdoor aquatic centres in Australia. *Sport Management Review*, 16, 268-284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2012.10.001>
- Kaplanidou, K., & Gibson, H. J. (2010). Predicting behavioral intentions of active event sport tourists: The case of a small-scale recurring sports event. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 15(2), 163-179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2010.498261>
- Kaplanidou, K., & Vogt, C. (2007). The interrelationship between sport event and destination image and sport tourists' behaviours. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3-4), 183-206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080701736932>
- Kaplanidou, K., & Vogt, C. (2010). The meaning and measurement of a sport event experience among active sport tourists. *Journal of Sport Management*, 24(5), pp. 544-566. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.24.5.544>
- Kaplanidou, K., Jordan, J. S., Funk, D., & Ridinger, L. L. (2012). Recurring sport events and destination image perceptions: Impact on active sport tourist behavioural intentions and place attachment. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(3), 237-248. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.26.3.237>
- Kirkup, N., & Sutherland, M. (2017). Exploring the relationships between motivation, attachment and loyalty within sport event tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(1), 7-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1046819>
- Klaus, P., & Maklan, S. (2011). Bridging the gap for destination extreme sports - A model of sports tourism customer experience. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27(13-14), 1341-1365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2011.624534>
- Ko, Y. J., & Pastore, D. L. (2005). A hierarchical model of service quality for the recreational sport industry. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14(2), 84-97.
- Ko, Y. J., Zhang, J., Cattani, K., & Pastore, D. (2011). Assessment of event quality in major spectator sports. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 21(3), 304-322. A hierarchical model of service quality for the recreational sport industry. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0960452111127983>
- Kotler, P. (2003). *Marketing Management* (11th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kouthouris, C., & Alexandris, K. (2005). Can service quality predict customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions in the sport tourism industry? An application of the SERVQUAL model in an outdoors setting. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 10(2), 101-111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080500223165>

- Kruger, M. & Viljoen, A. (2019). Destination vs event attributes: Enduring spectators' loyalty, *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 20(5), 375–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15470148.2019.1691696>
- Kulczycki, C. & Halpenny, E.A. (2014). Sport cycling tourists' setting preferences, appraisals and attachments. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 19(2), 169–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2015.1070741>
- Lee, J.-H., Kim, H.-D., Ko, Y. J., & Sagas, M. (2011). The influence of service quality on satisfaction and intention: A gender segmentation strategy. *Sport Management Review*, 14(1), 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2010.02.002>
- Madrigal, R. (1995). Cognitive and affective determinants of fan satisfaction with sporting event attendance. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27, 205–227.
- Melo, R., & Gomes, R. (2017). Nature sports participation: Understanding demand, practice profile, motivations and constraints. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 16, 108–135.
- Mintel. (2014). *Spectator sports UK*. Retrieved from <http://academic.mintel.com/display/679938/>
- Mirehie, M., & Gibson, H. (2020). Empirical testing of destination attribute preferences of women snow-sport tourists along a trajectory of participation. *Tourism Recreation Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2020.1756098>
- Mouratidis, K., Doumi, M., & Thanopoulos, V. (2020). Spectators' satisfaction of a small-scale sport event and intention to re-visit the sport event's destination. In *Cultural and Tourism Innovation in the Digital Era*, 399–412. Springer, Cham.
- Muskat, B., Hörtnagl, T., Prayag, G., & Wagner, S. (2019). Perceived quality, authenticity, and price in tourists' dining experiences: Testing competing models of satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 25(4), 480–498. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766718822675>
- Newland, B. L., & Aicher, T. J. (2018). Exploring sport participants' event and destination choices. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 22(2), 131–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2018.1436464>
- Nghiêm-Phú, B. (2018). Correlation between tourists' perceptions/evaluations of destination attributes and their overall satisfactions: Observations of a meta-analysis. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 19, 98–115.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 460–469.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring customer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Perić, M., Đurkin, J., & Vitezić, V. (2018). Active event sport tourism experience: the role of the natural environment, safety and security in event business models. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 13(5), 758–772. <https://doi.org/10.2495/SDP-V13-N5-758-772>
- Perić, M., Vitezić, V., & Đurkin Badurina, J. (2019). Business models for active outdoor sport event tourism experiences. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 32, 100561. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100561>
- Perić, M., Wise, N., & Dragičević, D. (2017). Suggesting a service research agenda in sport tourism: Working experience(s) into business models. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 7(1), 58–76. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SBM-09-2015-0031>
- Plunkett, D., & Brooks, T. J. (2018). Examining the relationship between satisfaction, intentions, and post-trip communication behaviour of active event sport tourists. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 22(4), 303–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2018.1532806>
- Portugal, A. C., Campos, F., Martins, F., & Melo, R. (2017). Understanding the relation between serious surfing, surfing profile, surf travel behaviour and destination attributes preferences. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 16, 55–73.

- Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Muskat, B., & Del Chiappa, G. (2017). Understanding the relationships between tourists' emotional experiences, perceived overall image, satisfaction, and intention to recommend. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56(1), 41–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287515620567>
- Ratten, V. (2011). Sport-based entrepreneurship: towards a new theory of entrepreneurship and sport management. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(1), 57–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-010-0138-z>
- Ratten, V. (2019). Social innovation in sport: the creation of Santa Cruz as a world surfing reserve. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 11(1), 20–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-12-2017-0135>
- Ratten, V. (2019). Tourism entrepreneurship research: a perspective article. *Tourism Review*, 75(1), 122–125. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-06-2019-0204>
- Reinhold, S., Zach, F. J., & Krizaj, D. (2019). Business models in tourism – state of the art. *Tourism Review*, 74(6), 1120–1134. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-02-2018-0027>
- Roche, S., Spake, D.F., & Joseph, M. (2013). A model of sporting event tourism as economic development. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 3, 147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20426781311325078>
- Romo, V., Chinchilla J. L., & García M. (2010). Sports management services: The dimension of quality. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, 5(2), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.4100/jhse>
- Saayman, M., & Saayman, A. (2012). Determinants of spending: An evaluation of three major sporting events. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(2), 124–138. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.841>
- Scholtz, M. (2019). One ultramarathon, two cities: differences in social impact perceptions. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 23(4), 181–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2019.1654905>
- Schulenkorf, N. & Edwards, D. (2012). Maximizing positive social impacts: Strategies for sustaining and leveraging the benefits of intercommunity sport events in divided societies. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(5), 379–390. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jism.26.5.379>
- Seabra, C., Dolnicar, S., Abrantes, J.L. & Kastenholtz, E. (2013). Heterogeneity in risk and safety perceptions of international tourists. *Tourism Management*, 36, 502–510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.09.008>
- Shipway, R. & Fyall, A. (2012). *International Sports Events: Impacts, Experiences and Identities*. London: Routledge.
- Shonk, D. J., & Chelladurai, P. (2008). Service quality, satisfaction, and intent to return in event sport tourism. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(5), 587–602. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jism.22.5.587>
- Shonk, D. J., & Chelladurai, P. (2009). Model of service quality in event sport tourism: development of a scale. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 6(3), 292–307. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSMM.2009.02909>
- Shonk, D. J., Bravo, G. A., Velez-Colon, L., & Lee, C. (2017). Measuring event quality, satisfaction, and intent to return at an international sport event: The ICF Canoe Slalom World Championships. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 2(2), 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24704067.2017.1317011>
- Stienmetz, J., Kim, J., Xiang, Z., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2020). Managing the structure of tourism experiences: Foundations for tourism design. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 10(4), 408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100408>
- Theodorakis, N. D., Kaplanidou, K., Alexandris, K., & Papadimitriou, D. (2019). From sport event quality to quality of life: The role of satisfaction and purchase happiness. *In Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 20(3), 241–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15470148.2019.1637805>
- Thwaites, D. (1999). Closing the gaps: service quality in sport tourism. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 13(6), 500 – 516. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876049910298766>
- Thwaites, D., & Chadwick, S. (2005). Service quality perspectives in sport tourism. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 8(2), 321–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430430500087781>

- Tsai, S. (2012). Place attachment and tourism marketing: Investigating international tourists in Singapore. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(2), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.842>
- Tsitskari, E., Tsiotras, D., & Tsiotras, G. (2006). Measuring service quality in sport services. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 17(5), 623–631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360600588190>
- Tsuji, Y., Bennett, G., & Zhang, J. (2007). Consumer Satisfaction with an Action Sports Event. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 16(4), 199–208.
- Wäsche, H., Dickson, G., & Woll, A. (2013). Quality in regional sports tourism: a network approach to strategic quality management. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 18(2), 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2013.826593>
- Weed, M. (2009). Progress in sports tourism research? A meta-review and exploration of futures. *Tourism Management*, 30(5), 615–628. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.002>
- Weed, M., & Bull, C. (2009). *Sports Tourism: Participants, Policy and Providers (2nd ed.)*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Yeh, C-C., Hua, K-T., & Huang, C-H. (2016). Service quality improving effects and recreational benefits for sports tourism - A case study. *Tourism Economics*, 22(6) 1332–1337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354816616672357>
- Yoo, J. J. E., Newland, B., & Lee, W. (2020). Influencing active sport tourists' loyalty to event and destination. *Event Management*, 24(2-3), 2-3. <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599519X15506259856336>
- Yoshida, M. (2017). Consumer experience quality: A review and extension of the sport management literature. *Sport Management Review*, 20(5), 427–442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2017.01.002>
- Yoshida, M., & James, J. D. (2011). Service quality at sporting events: Is aesthetic quality a missing dimension? *Sport Management Review*, 14(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2009.06.002>
- Yuksel, A., Yuksel, F., & Bilim, Y. (2010). Destination attachment: Effects of customer satisfaction, and cognitive, affective and conative loyalty. *Tourism Management*, 31(2), 274–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.03.007>
- Zhang, Y., & Park, K. (2015). How to develop a sustainable and responsible hallmark sporting event? – Experiences from tour of Qinghai Lake International Road Cycling Race, using IPA method. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences*, 15(1-2), 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15980634.2015.1118877>

Received: 13/05/2020

Accepted: 26/09/2020

Coordinating editor: Stanislav Ivanov