

Experiential value of participation in angling competition – a study from Finland

Jarno Suni ^{1*}, Raija Komppula ² and Raine Kortet ³

¹ Business School, University of Eastern Finland. Email: jarno.suni@uef.fi

² Business School, University of Eastern Finland. Email: raija.komppula@uef.fi

³ Department of Environmental & Biological Sciences, University of Eastern Finland. Email: raine.kortet@uef.fi

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Competitive fishing is a global phenomenon covering thousands of fishing contests annually. We studied the experiential value of angling competitions from the participants' point of view by using an online survey data among Finnish anglers who had been on an overnight angling competition trip within the last two years. The theory of consumption values is used as the basis for our theoretical framework, including functional, social, emotional, epistemic, and conditional value, while togetherness was suggested as the sixth value dimension. The value dimensions were measured with 45 variables. We used principal component and cluster analyses to identify three value-based clusters among respondents: Wellbeing seekers, Family-oriented competitors, and Novelty seekers. Novelty seekers were the youngest and least experienced group who are looking for novelty and they want to learn new things in competitive angling. Family-oriented competitors were the oldest and most experienced in competitive angling, and they valued friendship, family, and togetherness more than others. Wellbeing seekers were focused on self-development and positive effects on their wellbeing. Notably, proper and equal competition arrangements were the most important source of functional value. Surprisingly, the role of catching fish per se seems to be a minor contributor to the fishing competition experience value.

Keywords: Fishing tourism, customer value, tourist experience, experience value, special interest tourism

Citation: Suni, J., Komppula, R. and Kortet, R. (2022). Experiential value of participation in angling competition – a study from Finland. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 32, 3213.



© 2022 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/>

1. Introduction

Competitive fishing refers to organized events where anglers compete against each other and fish for inducements, which may vary from material or monetary prizes to awards and public recognition (Schramm Jr & Harrison, 2008). The major inducements also include the catch *per se* and the satisfaction of catching a fish (Kerr & Kamke, 2003). Competitive fishing events range from premier events organized by private businesses to small local events conducted by local and regional fishing clubs or civic organizations (Schramm Jr & Harrison, 2008). International events, such as the World Championship tournaments may be held under the umbrella of Confédération Internationale de la Pêche Sportive. Competitive fishing is a popular leisure-time activity in most parts of the world, but differences between countries are quite distinct: for example, in Germany, only events that are organized primarily to manage the fish community are allowed (Meinelt *et al.*, 2008), but in the USA, competitive angling may even be part of angler's vocational mix (Evans, 2008). Due to lack of available information, it is difficult to estimate the number of competitive fishing events globally (Schramm Jr & Harrison, 2008), but for example in Europe and Fennoscandia thousands of fishing competitions are held annually (e.g., Finnish Federation for Recreational Fishing, 2020) and in North America the number of events has been more than 25,000 every year (Kerr & Kamke, 2003). For the United States, recent official statistics regarding the number of fishing competitions were not available, but the website American Fishing Contests (2020) had over 26,000 event listings on website's forum for year 2019.

As the scale of the phenomenon is globally notable, researchers have started to reveal its potential direct and indirect importance for the participants and host communities (e.g., Petchenick, 2009; Wołos *et al.*, 2008). For the host community's benefit, competitive sport fishing events can enhance off-season tourism (Curtis *et al.*, 2017), but may also be used as a mechanism for social cohesion and community development (Brown *et al.*, 2012). From the participant's perspective, competitions serve as an opportunity to improve skills (Curtis *et al.*, 2017), to experience social interaction, and develop networks with like-minded people. Although competitive fishing is popular among anglers, only a few studies have been conducted in this context (e.g., Falk, *et al.*, 1989; Wilde, *et al.* 1998). Prior studies have touched upon the financial aspect of competitive fishing (Chi, 2018; Curtis *et al.*, 2017; Mckean *et al.*, 2014), fishing competition catches (Agius Darmanin & Vella, 2018), the impacts of fishing tournaments on fish populations (Cooke & Suski, 2005), and the administrative policies of competitive fishing (Kerr & Kamke, 2003).

Additionally, to the best of our knowledge, there seems to be no peer-reviewed published research on competitive fishing participants as tourists. Additionally, most studies that deal with fishing tourism do not use that term, and there is not much research published on fishing in the mainstream tourism journals. Instead, several studies on angler motivations (Arlinghaus, 2006; Beardmore *et al.*, 2011; Knopf *et al.*, 1973; Magee *et al.*, 2018; Skrzypczak & Karpiński, 2020), recreational fishing outcomes (Driver & Knopf, 1976), fishing trip satisfaction (Beardmore *et al.*, 2015; Golden *et al.*, 2019; Holland & Ditton, 1992), gender issues (Burkett & Carter, 2020; Schroeder *et al.*, 2006), classification or segmentation of recreational anglers (Kyle *et al.*, 2007; Magee *et al.*, 2018), anglers as potential tourists (e.g., Ditton *et al.*, 2002; Fedler & Ditton, 1986; Graefe, 1981), or constraints on participation in fishing (Kuehn *et al.*, 2013; Stensland *et al.*, 2017) have been published. These are particularly by researchers looking at the human dimensions of recreational fishing, or by researchers examining leisure and recreation. Research on Scandinavian fishing tourism has mostly focused on topics such as entrepreneurship (e.g., Waldo & Paulrud, 2012), and development and sustainability (e.g., Solstrand, 2013; Stensland, 2010, 2013). Nevertheless, it must be noted that even though the word tourism or tourist may not have been explicitly mentioned in fishing studies, many of them may study topics that are related to non-resident

fishing (e.g., Stensland *et al.*, 2017). To the best of the authors' knowledge, the only competitive fishing-related study by Perić, Vitezić and Badurina (2019), deals with business models for active outdoor sports events and includes angling competition as one of the studied event types.

In this study, we are particularly interested in the experiential value of angling competitions from the participants' point of view, referring to the participants' expectations and/or the experienced internal and external benefits of the participation in an angling competition. Internal benefits are related to the competition as such, and the external benefits are linked to the pleasure of participating in the event (Yuan & Wu, 2008). We focus on those events which are "touristic" in nature, meaning events that attract participants from all over the country or province and possibly from abroad. Therefore, participation in an angling competition is understood as a tourist experience, indicating that the competition participation requires an overnight stay away from home. In our study, we apply the consumption value theory by Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991), which has already served as a theoretical framework for several studies investigating the value of tourist experiences (e.g., Hallem & Barth, 2011; Prebensen & Xie, 2017; Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Tapachai & Waryszak, 2000; Williams & Soutar, 2000, 2009). Even though several authors have used the term "experience value" (Bjork, 2014; Prebensen *et al.*, 2014), value theories by Holbrook (1999) or Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991) have not been utilized in the conceptualization. Based on these value theories, first, our main objective is to distinguish the value dimensions of the angling competition-related experience for the participants. Second, we examine potential differences between the participants based on the frequency of participation, type of angling competition, travel companionship as well as sociodemographic background.

2. Consumption value theory in the context of tourist experience

In this study, the tourist experience related to angling competitions is considered as a consumer experience, and as a multidimensional outcome of a trip (Walls *et al.*, 2011). The experience is influenced by interactions with other people, the fishing activity itself, as well as services and service-scapes (Walls *et al.*, 2011). Additionally, the participants' characteristics (Ryan, 2010) and previous experiences (Larsen, 2007) have an impact on the realized experience.

The theory of consumption values by Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991) serves as the basis for the theoretical framework of this study, suggesting five value dimensions: functional value, social value, emotional value, epistemic value, and conditional value. Additionally, *togetherness* is suggested as a sixth value dimension. Earlier research on angler satisfaction has been based on satisfaction models rooted in the disconfirmation paradigm and post-experience evaluations, but the value concept refers to both pre- and post-trip assessment (Eggert & Ulaga, 2002). Pre-trip expectations of value reflect the needs, goals, and purposes of the consumer (Komppula, 2005), connecting hence in this study to the Recreation Experience Preference (REP) scale, which is used often in leisure and recreation research, with 19 domains and 328 items containing some of the dimensions (Manfredo *et al.*, 1996). Additionally, this study uses the Leisure Motivation Scale (e.g., Ryan & Glendon, 1998). Finally, it must be noted that value perceptions are context and situation-specific (Komppula, 2005).

Traditionally functional values have been suggested as primary drivers of consumer choice, referring to how well the product, service, or activity fulfils its purpose (Sheth *et al.*, 1991; Williams & Soutar, 2009). In fishing, the functional value would mirror a consumption orientation (Kyle *et al.*, 2007), which can be measured in relation to four domains: catching something, catching big fish, catching numbers of fish, and consuming the caught fish (Magee *et al.*, 2018). In terms of angling competitions, the functional value can relate, for example, to the competition arrangements (Perić *et al.*, 2019) and the quality of the catch. Relating to competition rules, in most of the traditional fishing competitions (e.g., ice-fishing

and angling competitions) the total catch matters the most, i.e., many small fish may be fully equal to one very large fish. However, in some fishing competitions, the rules put the highest emphasis and rewards on the larger fish.

Social value refers to seeking social esteem (Sheth *et al.*, 1991), and this can involve sharing success and know-how with one's own networks and peers (Oh & Syn, 2015). On the REP scale, one domain titled "Achievement/Stimulation" contains aspects linked to social recognition and telling others, which both represent social values (Manfredo *et al.*, 1996). A study by Golden, Free and Jensen (2019) shows that an opportunity to fish at an exotic destination and/or catch exceptional fish may be a motivation for a fishing trip and making this sort of trip may contribute to an angler's reputation among other anglers.

Emotional value refers to the ability of the service or activity to arouse feelings and/or emotional states in the customer (Sheth *et al.*, 1991). The feelings may be positive (e.g., self-confidence, love, and joy) or negative (e.g., fear, hesitation, and apprehension) (Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007; Williams & Soutar, 2009). On the Leisure Motivation Scale, emotional value might refer to motivations relating to relaxation and escapism (Ryan & Glendon, 1998), and on the REP scale it may refer to the domains of enjoying nature, introspection, nostalgia, and escaping personal and physical pressure (Manfredo *et al.*, 1996). Several studies on recreational fishing refer to feelings such as excitement and self-fulfilment (Golden *et al.*, 2019; Skrzypczak & Karpiński, 2020), and to the beauty and tranquility of nature (Arlinghaus, 2006; Beardmore *et al.*, 2015; Golden *et al.*, 2019; Magee *et al.*, 2018; Skrzypczak & Karpiński, 2020) as a contributor towards angler satisfaction. Perceptions on the effect of outdoor activities on an individual's physical and mental health can also be regarded as emotional states which can create value for the individual. There is a lot of evidence of the positive effects on health and wellbeing while participating in nature-based activities and of travelling in general (Chen & Petrick, 2013), and there have been a few studies on the wellbeing effects of fishing (Griffiths *et al.*, 2017; McManus *et al.*, 2011).

Epistemic value is about novelty seeking, curiosity and self-development (Sheth *et al.*, 1991), referring to the motivation to discover, learn and explore (Ryan & Glendon, 1998). The competence-mastery component of leisure motivation also refers to epistemic value, indicating the search for achievement, mastering things, challenge, and competition (Adle *et al.*, 2008; Prebensen & Xie, 2017; Ryan & Glendon, 1998). On the REP scale, domains such as learning, new people, and a few factors in the domain of "achievement-stimulus" refer to epistemic value (Manfredo *et al.*, 1996). The challenge of catching a fish and the desire to learn more about the activity have been found to be important motivations for recreational fishing (Golden *et al.*, 2019; Magee *et al.*, 2018). Learning and self-development are also related to Robert Stebbins's (1992, 2007) theory of serious leisure and Hobson Bryan's (1977, 1979) theory of recreation specialization. Being "serious" or "specialized" means to have a goal-oriented, committed long-term orientation towards a hobby, which gives a deep sense of satisfaction and fulfilment based on the participants' perseverance and activity, and therefore offers the participant an opportunity to develop their own skills, knowledge, and expertise.

Conditional value refers to such elements or attributes that either enable or prevent someone from gaining functional or social value (Hallem & Barth, 2011; Sheth *et al.*, 1991). In terms of angling competitions, proximity, accessibility, cheap travel (Tapachai & Waryszak, 2000) or, for example, competition prizes would be indicators of conditional value (Perić *et al.*, 2019). These conditional value-related elements can be seen to be connected with leisure activity constraints and facilitators (Jackson *et al.*, 1993), which in turn influence participation (Raymore, 2002).

As social interaction has been proven to be highly significant in creating value for the customer in tourism and leisure (e.g., Kim *et al.*, 2003; Ryan, 2010), *togetherness* is added as a new value dimension to complement the framework by Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991). The togetherness value was found to be an essential aspect of the hunting tourism experience by Komppula and Gartner (2013), referring to sharing the experiences on-site with friends and/or with family. The social component of leisure motivation refers both to the need for friendship and interpersonal relationships (the togetherness value) and to the need for esteem in the eyes of others (social value) (Ryan & Glendon, 1998; Sheth *et al.*, 1991). On the REP scale togetherness is divided into aspects describing “family togetherness” and “similar people”, the latter referring to friends and members of groups (Manfredo *et al.*, 1996).

3. Method and materials

3.1. Study area

The context of this study is Finland, where several angling contests of different types are organized every weekend throughout the year (e.g., Finnish Federation for Recreational Fishing, 2020). Competitions are arranged in practically all legal sportfishing categories including traditional float angling, coarse angling, ice-angling, fly-fishing and different types of lure fishing from boats. The target species in different competitions typically vary from smaller- and middle-sized cyprinids, ruffe (*Gymnocephalus cernua*) and perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) to larger predatory fish like the northern pike (*Esox lucious*), pike-perch (*Sander lucioperca*), Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*). The duration of most contests is varying from four to six hours, but also longer contests are occasionally arranged (Finnish Federation for Recreational Fishing, 2020). The numbers of participants in these events typically vary from 30 to 300 anglers. Larger events can draw up to 1,500 anglers. Ice angling competitions in winter are among the most popular Finnish sport angling events. Moreover, during the open water season, traditional angling competitions can also draw up to 500 participants. Some participants travel long distances to the events, even in poor weather conditions. Fishing competitions in Finland include both catch-and-release competitions and catch-and-kill competitions, and occasionally competitions that represent hybrids of these two different competition categories are held. In Finland, there are approximately 1.6 million recreational fishers (Luke, 2015). According to a recent study (Turunen, 2019) approximately 26% of Finnish recreational anglers who have been on a domestic fishing tourism trip have also participated in angling competitions.

3.2. Data collection and preparation

Our aim is to broaden the earlier experiential value research in special interest tourism (hunting and fishing) to encompass a special event context. During the spring 2020, our aim was to collect data with paper questionnaire in several angling competition events. However, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the angling competitions were cancelled in Finland. Therefore, a decision was made to collect the survey data during May 2020 with an online questionnaire (Appendix A), which included questions related to the experience value of the event from the anglers' point of view, the frequency of participation in angling competitions, and the sociodemographic profile of the respondents. The survey questionnaire was tested with a convenience sample collected among the networks of researchers, which also contained anglers who can be regarded as angling competition ‘tourists’ as defined in the manuscript. The web survey was open for a month. Information about the survey was advertised and distributed via social media channels, i.e., on three popular Facebook discussion forums and the official account of the Finnish Federation for Recreational Fishing. A reminder regarding the survey was posted twice on each channel.

Overall, 532 respondents answered the survey. The data was checked for extreme outliers and nine responses were removed data because of unrealistic and impossible answers. The analysis was then

based on data from respondents who had been on an overnight domestic and/or international angling competition trip within the last two years ($n = 293$). The value dimensions were measured with 45 variables. Functional value items were adapted from the study by Kyle *et al.* (2007), who segmented anglers based on their angling involvement and consumption orientation. Other dimension variables were modified based on the REP Scale (Manfredo *et al.*, 1996) as well as earlier research on consumer values in tourism (Gallarza & Saura, 2006; Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007), hunting, and rural tourism (Komppula & Gartner, 2013; Komppula & Suni, 2013; Pesonen *et al.*, 2011). The consumption value variables were measured with 7-point Likert scale, where 1 indicated an opinion 'strongly disagree' and 7 meant 'strongly agree'. For the analysis, two variable statements were modified as opposites to ensure a similar, continuous scale from negative to positive for all items. These items were 'I do not have to catch fish in an angling competition for it be enjoyable' and 'An angling competition just itself is a boring experience'. New forms for the statements were 'I have to catch fish in an angling competition for it to be enjoyable' and 'An angling competition just itself is not a boring experience'.

3.3. Data analysis

A principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation was used to distinguish the value dimensions. All analyses were run using the IBM SPSS 27 Statistics program. The data was optimized by removing all variables with communality values under 0.4, items that loaded on a component alone, and items that loaded on two or more components. Together, twelve variables were removed during the process (four emotional value items, four epistemic value items, two conditional value items, a functional value, and a social value item). The twelve removed items are marked in Appendix A.

Applicability was examined using a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Bartlett's test of sphericity. The KMO value was 0.73, and PCA results explained 68% of the total variance. Bartlett's test was considered significant at $p < 0.001$. The principal components were named based on the variables included. The Cronbach's alpha was calculated to test each component's reliability. According to Nunnally (1994), in explorative research the limit for the Cronbach's alpha should be at least 0.5–0.6. All components reached this level or higher.

Similar to study by Stensland and Aas (2014), a hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward's method was used to determine the best number of clusters and their initial cluster centroids. Cluster centroids from the hierarchical analysis were used as a starting point in the K-means cluster analysis. The difference and reliability of clusters were tested with the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test as well as the difference in sociodemographic variables where suitable. Furthermore, an ANOVA and Tukey's test were used to analyze the differences between the clusters.

4. Results

4.1. Sociodemographic characteristics

Based on the whole data, most of the respondents were male (84%), and typically aged 45–64 (44%) or 25–44 (35%) years old (Table 1). In 2018, approximately 18% of Finnish anglers were females but certain age groups are underrepresented in this data, namely anglers under 17 and over 65 years old (Luke, 2019). Since we used convenience sampling in data collection, it was not assumed that we would receive a sample that could be generalized to a larger population. However, presenting the sociodemographic data gives some background information about the respondents, which is interpreted more in the discussion section.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents

	All data (n=293)	
	n	%
Sex		
Male	246	84 %
Female	47	16 %
Age		
Under 18	4	1 %
18-24	7	2 %
25-44	102	35 %
45-64	129	44 %
Over 64	51	17 %
Area of residence		
Southern Finland	75	26 %
Western Finland	58	20 %
Eastern Finland	67	23 %
Province of Oulu	46	16 %
Lapland	21	7 %
Missing	26	9 %
Marital status		
Relationship (a child or children)	104	35 %
Relationship (no children living at home)	140	48 %
Single	42	14 %
Single parent	7	2 %
Education		
Basic level	46	16 %
Upper secondary level	76	26 %
College level training	75	26 %
Bachelor's degree	59	20 %
Master's degree or higher	37	13 %
Annual gross earnings		
Under 10 000 €	16	5 %
10 000–19 999 €	28	10 %
20 000–29 999 €	57	19 %
30 000–39 999 €	72	25 %
40 000–49 999 €	54	18 %
50 000 € and over	66	23 %

4.2. Angling competition-related characteristics

Angling competition-related characteristics for all respondents are shown in Table 2. Based on the mean data values, the respondents were experienced in participating in angling competitions (with around 25 years of competition experience on average) and they had spent around 35 days a year at competitions. Typically, during the year, they travelled shorter distances (50–100 km) 13 times and longer distances (over 100 km) 11 times for fishing competitions. Usually, the anglers stayed for around 7 days on their competition trips in Finland and/or abroad. Ice fishing was the most popular competitive type of angling (50%) and overnight competition trips in Finland were done most likely with friends (54%). The respondents had been on angling competition trips mostly in Finland (94%), Sweden (10%) and somewhere else (10%), for example to Bulgaria, Norway, Croatia, and Spain.

Table 2. Respondents' angling competition-related characteristics

	All data (n=293)	
	Mean	S.D.
Angling competition related information		
Number of years participating in angling competitions	25.6	13.9
Number of days spent on angling competitions in a year	35.3	33.4
Average number of winter season competitions	16.5	16.0
Average number of open water season competitions	13.7	18.1
Times travelled outside area of residence to a fishing competition event (50-100km)	13.1	17.2
Times travelled outside area of residence to a fishing competition event (over 100km)	11.5	14.8
Days spent on overnight fishing competition trips in Finland or abroad during last 12 months	7.3	9.8
Favorite method of competitive fishing		
Ice fishing	147	50%
Traditional angling	40	14%
Pier fishing	11	4%
Trolling	48	16%
Lure fishing	21	7%
Fly fishing	26	9%
Have been on an angling competition trip in ... during last two years*		
Finland	276	94%
Sweden	30	10%
Somewhere else	30	10%
Usual travel companion(s) for domestic overnight angling competition trips		
No companion(s)	37	13%
Spouse	36	12%
Family	16	5%
Friends	157	54%
Fishing club	42	14%
Other organization	5	2%

Note: * The respondents could choose more than one option.

4.3. The components of angling competition experience value

The PCA resulted in eleven components (Table 3). Based on the Cronbach's alpha values, overall, the reliability of the sum variables was relatively good ($\alpha > 0.5$). The eigenvalue represents the amount of variance accounted for by a factor, and in PCA, by a component. Simply put, the higher the eigenvalue, the better the variables explain the content of the component. All eleven components had eigenvalues of one or greater. For some components, a higher Cronbach's alpha level would have been possible to achieve based on their 'if deleted'-value. However, removing more variables from the PCA resulted in distorted component structures, as well as nonlogical and hard to interpret components. Since optimizing component reliability was not the objective of this study, further analyses were carried out with the eleven-component solution.

Table 3. Results of the PCA for value dimensions

Principal components and items	Loading	Eigenvalue	Variance	Mean	S.D.	Cronbach's α (if removed)	Variable's value type
Component 1: Enjoyment		5.1	15.5	4.4		0.76	
An angling competition can be enjoyable even if I do not succeed in the competition	0.81			5.3	1.71	(0.69)	Functional
I would be happy with the competition even if I would not catch any fish	0.77			3.2	2.06	(0.68)	Functional
I do not have to catch fish for the angling competition to be enjoyable	0.76			3.6	1.98	(0.70)	Functional
Participating in an angling competition should not be too serious	0.66			5.4	1.73	(0.75)	Emotional
Component 2: Social value		2.9	8.7	4.6		0.74	
I like to tell my friends about my angling competition achievements	0.81			4.8	1.61	(0.60)	Social
I am happy and proud to tell my friends about my angling competitions	0.73			5.6	1.36	(0.66)	Social
I like to share pictures about angling competitions on social media and other angling-related forums	0.67			3.7	2.00	(0.75)	Social
My friends appreciate me based on my angling competition achievements	0.66			4.4	1.63	(0.70)	Social
Component 3: Novelty and learning		2.4	7.4	5.4		0.74	
I like to try and learn new methods of competitive angling	0.80			5.3	1.63	(0.62)	Epistemic
I like to participate in angling competitions because I can learn something new	0.77			6.2	1.11	(0.65)	Epistemic
I like to catch new species when angling competitively	0.69			4.3	1.83	(0.70)	Epistemic
Angling competition provides me often with "wow" experiences	0.56			5.9	1.25	(0.72)	Emotional
Component 4: Solitude		2.1	6.4	4.7		0.82	
I like to be in a silent and peaceful location	0.89			4.8	1.69	(0.69)	Emotional
Enjoying solitude is a part of my angling competition experience	0.83			4.3	2.03	(0.77)	Emotional
I like to give space for my own thoughts	0.81			5.0	1.65	(0.79)	Emotional
Component 5: Wellbeing		2.0	6.1	5.8		0.79	
My physical health is better because of participating in angling competitions	0.80			5.9	1.51	(0.62)	Emotional
My mental health is better because of participating in angling competitions	0.77			6.1	1.36	(0.66)	Emotional
I sleep better after going to an angling competition	0.63			5.4	1.43	(0.85)	Emotional
Component 6: Constraints		1.7	5.2	5.4		0.76	
The distance between angling competition location and home will not affect my participation	0.85			5.0	1.66	(0.58)	Conditional
I will take part in an angling competition despite the total cost	0.83			5.0	1.56	(0.60)	Conditional
Despite the weather and other circumstances, I will take part in an angling competition as I had planned	0.67			6.1	1.14	(0.80)	Conditional
Component 7: Family		1.4	4.3	4.4		0.70	
I enjoy competitive angling as it is a mutual hobby for my family	0.83			4.6	2.08	(0.40)	Togetherhness
It is important for me to compete with my family in an angling competition	0.76			2.9	2.04	(0.71)	Togetherhness
I want to teach the angling competition tradition to my family members	0.67			5.8	1.54	(0.68)	Togetherhness

Principal components and items	Loading	Eigenvalue	Variance	Mean	S.D.	Cronbach's α (if removed)	Variable's value type
Component 8: Friendship		1.3	4.0	5.0		0.58	
It is important for me to go to angling competitions with specific friends	0.80			4.5	1.75	(0.32)	Togetherness
I mostly compete in angling to spend time with friends	0.70			5.1	1.55	(0.40)	Togetherness
It is important for me to compete with my friends in an angling competition	0.56			5.4	1.65	(0.66)	Togetherness
Component 9: The need to catch large fish		1.3	3.85	3.0		0.75	
The bigger the fish I catch, the better the angling competition	0.85			3.1	1.93	-	Functional
In an angling competition, I would rather catch one or two big fish than many small ones	0.84			3.0	1.94	-	Functional
Component 10: Keeping the catch		1.0	3.12	2.1		0.56	
I must be able to keep the caught fish to be satisfied with a competition	0.79			1.9	1.4	-	Functional
I mainly fish competitively to get fish for nutrition	0.76			2.3	1.6	-	Functional
Component 11: Competition arrangements		1.0	3.05	6.6		0.59	
It is important to me that the arrangements of the competition are managed properly	0.76			6.5	0.77	-	Functional
It is important to me that the arrangements of the competition are equal	0.72			6.7	0.58	-	Functional

Note: Variable mean values were measured with a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. Component mean values are the average value of variables in the component. KMO = 0.73, Bartlett's test was $p < 0.001$.

With the eigenvalue (5.1) and variance explained (15.5%), *enjoyment* was the strongest principal component. This component was related to the functional and emotional value dimensions, and it focused on relaxed attitude towards the competition. *Social value* was the second component, referring to the willingness to build a certain profile among friends and peers. As its name says, this component is connected to social value. *Novelty and learning* was the third component. Variables in the component are related to the epistemic and emotional value dimensions. According to the mean value, this component is the third most important.

The fourth component, *solitude* focuses on a quest for peacefulness and solitude, and therefore relates to emotional value. *Wellbeing* reflects the positive notion and sense of wellbeing that angling competitions can give to the participants. *Persistence* depicts the willingness to overcome the challenges that the angling competition participants might face. This component is connected to conditional values. *Family* and *friendship* are components that connect with the value of *togetherness*. The ninth component, *the need to catch big fish*, is connected to functional values and describes the competitors' need to catch larger rather than smaller fish during the competition. The components *keeping the catch* and *competition arrangements* are related to functional values.

Based on the component mean values, equal and proper *competition arrangements* were considered very important ($m = 6.6$). Other components that were seen to be important were *novelty and learning* ($m = 5.4$), *wellbeing* ($m = 5.8$), *constraints* ($m = 5.4$), and *friendship* ($m = 5.0$). Components that were not considered important were *the need to catch large fish* ($m = 3.0$) and *keeping the catch* ($m = 2.1$). The rest of the components, *enjoyment* ($m = 4.4$), *social value* ($m = 4.6$), *solitude* ($m = 4.7$), and *family* ($m = 4.4$) were somewhat neutral in importance. The component *constraints* was supposed to reflect

conditional values, referring to elements that enabled or prevented the creation of functional or social values. However, the statements for this component were written in a form that had the opposite meaning. Therefore, from the perspective of conditional value, a high mean value in this case indicates that weather conditions, long distances, and the total cost did not prevent anglers from participating in competitions. *Constraints* relate to leisure constraints presented by Jackson, Crawford and Godbey (1993), and also in a way depict perseverance, which is used as one of the qualities for serious leisure (Stebbins, 1992) and as one of the measurements in the Serious Leisure Inventory and Measurement (SLIM) (Gould et al., 2008).

4.4. Cluster analysis

Cluster analysis resulted in three larger main clusters with a size of more or less 100 respondents each (Table 4). Further attempts with four or more clusters fragmented the clusters into smaller and smaller groups (less than ten respondents). Therefore, a three-cluster solution was chosen for its interpretability and usability in other statistical analyses.

For the members of the first cluster, *wellbeing* ($m = 6.0$) was the most important item. With all clusters, *competition arrangements* were considered important, however, with Cluster 1, they were not considered as important as in the other clusters ($m = 5.9$). Other important items were *constraints* ($m = 5.4$), *novelty and learning* ($m = 5.0$), *friendship* ($m = 5.0$), and *solitude* ($m = 4.9$). *The need to catch large fish* ($m = 2.6$) and *keeping the catch* ($m = 2.3$) were considered not important. We named Cluster 1 as Wellbeing seekers.

The most important items for respondents in the second cluster were *competition arrangements* ($m = 6.9$), *wellbeing* ($m = 6.2$), *constraints* ($m = 5.9$), *novelty and learning* ($m = 5.5$), *friendship* ($m = 5.3$) and *solitude* ($m = 5.1$). Compared to the other clusters, the members of Cluster 2 considered *family* ($m = 4.9$) the most important. *Enjoyment* ($m = 4.6$) and *social value* ($m = 4.5$) were also somewhat important for this cluster. Similarly, to Cluster 1, *the need to catch large fish* ($m = 2.9$) and *keeping the catch* ($m = 2.3$) were considered not important. Cluster 2 was named as Family-oriented competitors.

Table 4. The cluster analysis results with mean, standard deviation, F-test values, and p-values

Principal component	Wellbeing seekers ^a (n=70)		Family-oriented ^b (n=136)		Novelty seekers ^c (n=87)		F-test	p-value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Enjoyment	4.2	1.35	4.6	1.54	4.2	1.28	2.99	0.052
Social value	4.6	1.20	4.5	1.32	4.9	1.14	2.44	0.089
Novelty and learning	5.0 ^{b,c}	1.10	5.5 ^a	1.14	5.6 ^a	0.98	6.28	0.002
Solitude	4.9 ^c	1.32	5.1 ^c	1.46	3.8 ^{a,b}	1.48	23.88	<0.001
Wellbeing	6.0 ^c	1.09	6.2 ^c	0.87	5.1 ^{a,b}	1.43	26.68	<0.001
Constraints	5.4 ^{b,c}	0.96	5.9 ^{a,c}	0.96	4.5 ^{a,b}	1.28	42.65	<0.001
Family	4.3 ^b	1.42	4.9 ^{a,c}	1.51	3.9 ^b	1.37	12.36	<0.001
Friendship	5.0	1.35	5.3 ^c	1.11	4.6 ^b	1.12	11.32	<0.001
The need to catch large fish	2.6 ^c	1.65	2.9 ^c	1.68	3.5 ^{a,b}	1.78	5.45	0.005
Keeping the catch	2.3 ^c	1.23	2.3 ^c	1.35	1.7 ^{a,b}	1.00	6.85	0.001
Competition arrangements	5.9 ^{b,c}	0.43	6.9 ^{a,c}	0.18	6.8 ^{a,b}	0.30	332.41	<0.001

Note: Mean values are measured with a 7-point Likert scale. Superscript letters indicate which clusters have differences between each other (Tukey's Test for post-hoc analysis, $\alpha = 0.05$).

For members of the third cluster, equal and proper *competition arrangements* were important ($m = 6.8$). Different from the other clusters, members of Cluster 3 considered *novelty and learning* ($m = 5.6$) more important than *wellbeing* ($m = 5.1$). Other somewhat important components for this group were *social value* ($m = 4.9$), *friendship* ($m = 4.6$) and *constraints* ($m = 4.5$), but the rest of the items were considered neutral or not important. Different from the other clusters was that the members of Cluster 3 considered *the need to catch large fish* ($m = 3.5$) more important and *keeping the catch* ($m = 1.7$) less important than the others. Cluster 3 was named as Novelty seekers.

The highest F-test value was for *competition arrangements* ($F = 332.41$) and the smallest value was for *social value* ($F = 2.44$). In most cases, the tests gave the result $p < 0.001$ meaning that all the clusters differed significantly from each other, except for the components *fun* ($p = 0.05$), *social value* ($p = 0.09$), *novelty and learning* ($p < 0.05$), *the need to catch large fish* ($p < 0.01$) and *keeping the catch* ($p = 0.001$).

4.5. Sociodemographic and angling competition-related characteristics for each cluster

Sociodemographic data for each cluster is shown in Table 5. Related to age ($\chi^2 (9, N = 293) = 26.27, p < 0.05$), group Family-oriented competitors had the most elderly respondents (over 64 years old). Additionally, regarding marital status ($\chi^2 (6, N = 293) = 15.56, p < 0.05$), group Family-oriented competitors had the most respondents who were in a relationship and did not have children living at home.

Angling competition-related characteristics are compared between clusters in Table 6. The differences between clusters based on the ANOVA test and mean values were that Family-oriented competitors were the most active angling competition participants, and Novelty seekers were the least experienced and did not compete as much as the other groups. The experience is measured with number of years participating in angling competitions, number of days spent on angling competitions in a year, and average number of winter and open water season competitions. Ice fishing was the most common type of fishing competition for Wellbeing seekers and Family-oriented competitors, but Novelty seekers had more varied favorite competition methods (ice fishing 29%, trolling 24%, fly fishing 20%, lure fishing 17%). Friends were typically the most usual travel companions for all clusters, however for Family-oriented competitors, spouses were more typical compared to other clusters.

5. Discussion and conclusions

The results of the PCA show that the items used in this study successfully measured the different components of experiential value. Nevertheless, the original six component framework ended up producing an eleven-component solution, within which items measuring social value, two dimensions of togetherness, and conditional values did result in quite expected results. In the PCA, the functional value dimension was divided into four components: *competition arrangements*, *enjoyment*, *the need to catch large fish*, and *keeping the catch*. The dimension *competition arrangements* was the most important source of experience value. In a study by Perić *et al.* (2019), there were significant differences between motivation-based segments of active outdoor event tourists, indicating that the enthusiasts, representing the highest level of competitive attitude gave the highest value scores to all competition-related elements of the event.

Table 5. Sociodemographic data for each cluster

	Wellbeing seekers (n=70)		Family-oriented (n=136)		Novelty seekers (n=87)		χ^2	p-value
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Sex								
Male	56	80%	111	82%	79	91%	4.94	0.111
Female	14	20%	25	18%	8	9%		
Age							K-W H*	p-value
Under 18	1	1%	2	1%	1	1%	3.00	0.223
18–24	2	3%	3	2%	2	2%	0.53	0.768
25–44	26	37%	33	24%	43	49%	3.30	0.192
45–64	29	41%	62	46%	38	44%	7.70	0.021
Over 64	12	17%	36	26%	3	3%	1.29	0.524
Area of residence							χ^2	p-value
Southern Finland	16	23%	32	24%	27	31%	10.45	0.235
Western Finland	15	21%	23	17%	20	23%		
Eastern Finland	20	29%	30	22%	17	20%		
Province of Oulu	12	17%	25	18%	9	10%		
Lapland	3	4%	7	5%	11	13%		
Missing	4	6%	19	14%	3	3%		
Marital status							χ^2	p-value
Relationship (a child or children)	22	31%	40	29%	42	48%	15.56	0.016
Relationship (no children living at home)	31	44%	77	57%	32	37%		
Single	16	23%	15	11%	11	13%		
Single parent	1	1%	4	3%	2	2%		
Education							χ^2	p-value
Basic level	8	11%	29	21%	9	10%	22.11	0.005
Upper secondary level	11	16%	41	30%	24	28%		
College level training	17	24%	38	28%	20	23%		
Bachelor's degree	21	30%	17	13%	21	24%		
Master's degree or higher	13	19%	11	8%	13	15%		
Annual gross earnings							χ^2	p-value
Under 10 000 €	2	3%	9	7%	5	6%	14.87	0.137
10 000–19 999 €	6	9%	17	13%	5	6%		
20 000–29 999 €	13	19%	33	24%	11	13%		
30 000–39 999 €	20	29%	29	21%	23	26%		
40 000–49 999 €	13	19%	26	19%	15	17%		
50 000 € and over	16	23%	22	16%	28	32%		

Note: * Kruskal-Wallis Test was used to test age difference.

The anglers classified as Novelty Seekers were younger, and therefore had significantly less fishing competition experience, yet they had valued importance of competition arrangements very high. Taken together, this is an important finding, as it may have relevant implications for fishing competition organizers and the fishing competition tourism industry, pointing out that even competitive anglers with less experience value highly equal and properly managed competition arrangements indicating a serious attitude for competition even in early stages of competitive career. The industry should thus have especially high emphasis on fair and equal competition arrangements to keep the participants satisfied. This could be secured, for example, by applying detailed event-specific questionnaires to participants.

Table 6. Angling competition-related characteristics for each cluster

Angling competition related information	Wellbeing Seekers (n=70)		Family-oriented (n=136)		Novelty Seekers (n=87)		F-value	Sig.
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Number of years participating in angling competitions	26.2	12.6	29.9	14.2	18.4	11.3	20.8	<0.001
Number of days spent on angling competitions in a year	32.2	28.9	45.0	36.8	22.6	25.7	13.4	<0.001
Average number of winter season competitions	17.7	13.5	21.4	17.3	8.0	11.9	21.6	<0.001
Average number of open water season competitions	10.7	12.7	18.6	23.5	8.4	6.6	10.3	<0.001
Times travelled outside area of residence to a fishing competition event (50-100km)	13.1	13.7	16.8	21.1	7.3	10.1	8.6	<0.001
Times travelled outside area of residence to a fishing competition event (over 100km)	10.0	9.8	15.9	18.7	6.0	7.6	13.3	<0.001
Days spent on overnight fishing competition trips in Finland or abroad during last 12 months	7.8	15.3	7.5	7.5	6.5	7.0	0.4	0.667
Favorite method of competitive fishing	n	%	n	%	n	%	χ^2	Sig.
Ice fishing	43	61%	79	58%	25	29%	59.3	<0.001
Traditional angling	7	10%	26	19%	7	8%		
Pier fishing	2	3%	7	5%	2	2%		
Trolling	11	16%	16	12%	21	24%		
Lure fishing	1	1%	5	4%	15	17%		
Fly fishing	6	9%	3	2%	17	20%		
Have been on an angling competition trip in ... during last two years**	n	%	n	%	n	%	χ^2	Sig.
Finland	66	94%	126	93%	84	97%	62.5	0.101
Sweden	8	11%	15	11%	7	8%		
Somewhere else	5	7%	16	12%	7	8%		
Usual travel companion(s) for domestic overnight angling competition trips	n	%	n	%	n	%	χ^2	Sig.
No companion(s)	10	14%	15	11%	12	14%	22.9	0.011
Spouse	2	3%	29	21%	5	6%		
Family	3	4%	7	5%	6	7%		
Friends	45	64%	61	45%	51	59%		
Fishing club	9	13%	22	16%	11	13%		
Other organization	1	1%	2	1%	2	2%		

Note: * Respondents could choose more than one answer.

Enjoyment was regarded as important for all clusters. *Enjoyment* refers to the joy of participating in the competition, regardless of whether you succeed or not. Interestingly, *enjoyment* was only ranked eighth of all 11 components by mean value. The results are somewhat in contrast with the results in Perić *et al.*'s (2019) study, since in their data, success in competitions was the least important factor in other

than the enthusiast cluster, and enjoyment, referring to the joy of merely participating, was ranked highest in all segments.

One might suppose that the component describing *the need to catch large fish* was a crucial dimension of functional value, like the component *keeping the catch*, but these were actually the least important components. This might reflect the fact that competitive anglers are typically “serious” competitors, for example more serious than normal non-competitive anglers, who aim for mostly big fish or having a nice meal. However, in competitions, the rules determine how much and what type of fish are desired as a catch. In most of the traditional fishing competitions (e.g., ice-fishing and angling competitions), the total catch matters the most. Unfortunately, in this study, the importance of the catch amount was not directly measured, but for Wellbeing seekers and Family-oriented competitors, *the need to catch large fish* was less important and *keeping the catch* was more important than for Novelty seekers.

The emotional value dimension was divided between two components. *Wellbeing*, focusing on the positive effect of nature on physical and mental health, had the second highest mean value. Only Novelty seekers ranked this component outside the top two dimensions. Since angling competitions can sometimes be mass events, it is understandable that *solitude* was less appreciated, although it may be a crucial dimension of a nature experience in general. Several studies on recreational fishing (Arlinghaus, 2006; Beardmore et al., 2015; Golden et al., 2019; Magee et al., 2018; Skrzypczak & Karpiński, 2020) as well as a study on outdoor sport event experiences (Perić et al., 2019) have shown that elements of nature play a major role in contributing to the experience.

Epistemic value variables were divided between two components. The third component refers to *novelty and learning*, but also to searching for excitement, which might refer to an emotional value. The component was ranked as the third most important component with a mean value 5.4. *Novelty and learning* was regarded as one of the most important experience values. This notion is in line with Perić et al. (2019) in the sense that the most enthusiastic competition participants also highly valued improving their skills by competing. In the study by Skrzypczak and Karpiński (2020), excitement and self-fulfilment were the second most important motives for recreational fishing, escape to nature being the most important. The fourth most important value component contributing to the experience value was *constraints*. Respondents mostly agreed that poor weather conditions, distance between competition location and home, and total amount of competition related costs are not seen limiting factors for participation. In Kuehn et al.’s (2013) study about Lake Ontario resident anglers, poor weather conditions were seen as a limiting factor for fishing participation. Competitive anglers who travel to participate for a fishing event, seem to be less constrained by structural constraints, such as weather conditions.

The results show that most of the respondents already had a long career in angling competitions. Therefore, these respondents can be regarded as active sports tourists, referring to participation in sports away from home (Getz & McConnell, 2011). They could also be thought of as serious (Stebbins, 1992) or specialized (Bryan, 1977, 1979) sports tourists. Earlier research on active-sports-event travel careers (Buning & Gibson, 2016; Getz & McConnell, 2011) shows that active sports tourists tend to develop lifelong patterns to participate in sports events, and over the years their behavior and motivation evolve. The results are in line with Getz’s and McConnell’s (2011) study indicating that self-development and challenge, due to learning and novelty, play a major role contributing to the event experience.

Although, we did not focus on the event-tourist-career, this study may confirm the results by Getz and Andersson (2010) suggesting that highly involved event participants were also highly motivated by personal development motivators, such as health benefits, self-development, and fun, which in our study were important contributors of experience value. In general, highly involved participants are dedicated to their hobby or an activity, which can then become as a part of their self-identity and as the focus for their lifestyle (Getz & Andersson, 2010). In our study, the most highly involved group in angling competitions is the cluster Family-oriented. Furthermore, the items in our study measuring social value could have included more aspects linked to reputation, which may be particularly important among competitive anglers. The results are in accordance with Getz and Andersson (2010) in terms of temporal travel and spatial patterns, meaning that serious sports tourists travel to sports events all year round and travel also to events which may be far from home.

Catching fish is a requirement for the participant to succeed in the competition and the need for success might be related to the basic idea of participating in a competition. Competing is about mastery and performance (Adle *et al.*, 2008), and one would assume that if someone participates in a competition, the goal is to win or at least succeed. However, the results of this study show that as the role of catching fish *per se* seems to be a minor contributor to the fishing competition experience value. It can be argued that most of the respondents seemed to be more concerned with task mastery and personal improvement than performance goals when participating a fishing competition. Moreover, it is worth remembering that in angling contests the catch is always relative and that a very small absolute catch can sometimes still yield good success if conditions are difficult and the other participants' catches are even smaller. Based on this notion, a managerial implication for event organizers could be that satisfying fishing competition events are possible to organize also in water areas which are not abundant with fish. Adle, Duda, and Ntoumanis (2008) found out that the more the participants anticipated a sport competition as a positive challenge and opportunity for self-development, the more wellbeing effects they experienced. Our results indicate that while equal and proper competition arrangements played the most important role, wellbeing was regarded as the second most important component of the fishing competition experience. Younger competition anglers are looking for novelty and consider learning important. As an example, the event organizers could create different competition categories (e.g., using only certain type of fishing method or catching certain type of fish) to ensure that there would be possibly new challenges and learning opportunities. Considering competitors who are looking for solitude, like the group Family-oriented in our study, the event location should be big enough to avoid unnecessary crowdedness.

The value of togetherness could be a valuable addition to Sheth *et al.*'s (1991) framework of consumption values when examining special interest tourism related activities, such as competitive angling. As a limitation, the survey data was collected by using convenience sampling which often result into a non-representative sample, but this still can offer insights into population subgroups, which could be used, for example, for marketing purposes (Magee *et al.*, 2018). Considering future research, we suggest that it would be useful to also study the economic benefits and meaningfulness of angling competitions for the area of the competition. Furthermore, studies investigating the experiential value of angling competitions should include aspects of reputation relating to social value.

References

- Adle, J. W., Duda, J. L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2008). Achievement goals, competition appraisals, and the psychological and emotional welfare of sport participants. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 30(3), 302–322. doi: 10.1123/jsep.30.3.302

- Agius Darmanin, S., & Vella, A. (2018). An assessment of catches of shore sport fishing competitions along the coast of the Maltese Islands: Implications for conservation and management. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 25(2), 127–135. doi: 10.1111/fme.12271
- American Fishing Contests. (2020). *Statistics by state and month*. <http://americanfishingcontests.com/Contest/Statistics.aspx> (Accessed on 20.8.2021)
- Arlinghaus, R. (2006). On the apparently striking disconnect between motivation and satisfaction in recreational fishing: The case of catch orientation of German anglers. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 26(3), 592–605. doi: 10.1577/mo4-220.1
- Beardmore, B., Haider, W., Hunt, L. M., & Arlinghaus, R. (2011). The importance of trip context for determining primary angler motivations: Are more specialized anglers more catch-oriented than previously believed? *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 31(5), 861–879. doi: 10.1080/02755947.2011.629855
- Beardmore, B., Hunt, L. M., Haider, W., Dorow, M., & Arlinghaus, R. (2015). Effectively managing angler satisfaction in recreational fisheries requires understanding the fish species and the anglers. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 72(4), 500–513. doi: 10.1139/cjfas-2014-0177
- Bjork, P. (2014). Tourist experience value: Tourist experience and life satisfaction. In N. K. Prebensen, J. S. Chen, & M. Uysal (Eds.), *Creating Experience Value in Tourism* (pp. 22–32). Croydon: CABI. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0703993104
- Brown, A., Djohari, N., & Stolk, P. (2012). *Fishing for answers: The final report of the social and community benefits of angling project*. Manchester: Substance.
- Buning, R. J., & Gibson, H. J. (2016). Exploring the trajectory of active-sport-event travel careers: A social worlds perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(3), 265–281. doi: 10.1123/jsm.2015-0213
- Burkett, E., & Carter, A. (2020). It's not about the fish: Women's experiences in a gendered recreation landscape. *Leisure Sciences*, 1–18. doi: 10.1080/01490400.2020.1780522
- Chen, C. C., & Petrick, J. F. (2013). Health and wellness benefits of travel experiences: A literature review. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(6), 709–719. doi: 10.1177/0047287513496477
- Chi, Y. N. (2018). Scenario economic impact analysis of offshore fishing tournaments in Ocean City. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Management*, 5(5), 128–134. doi: 10.18488/journal.62.2018.55.128.134
- Curtis, J., Hynes, S., O'Reilly, P., & Breen, B. (2017). Recreational angling tournaments: participants' expenditures. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 21(3), 201–221. doi: 10.1080/14775085.2017.1322998
- Ditton, R. B., Holland, S. M., & Anderson, D. K. (2002). Recreational fishing as tourism. *Fisheries*, 27(3), 17–24. doi: 10.1577/1548-8446(2002)027<0017:rfat>2.0.co;2
- Driver, B. L., & Knopf, R. C. (1976). Temporary escape: One product of sport fisheries management. *Fisheries*, 1(2), 21–29.
- Eggert, A., & Ulaga, W. (2002). Customer perceived value: A substitute for satisfaction in business markets? *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 17(2–3), 107–118. doi: 10.1108/08858620210419754
- Evans, C. (2008). From the inside looking out: a tournament organization's perspective on growing competitive fishing. In Ø. Aas (Ed.), *Global Challenges in Recreational Fisheries* (pp. 259–267). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Falk, J. M., Graefe, A. R., & Ditton, R. B. (1989). Patterns of participation and motivation among saltwater tournament anglers. *Fisheries*, 14(4), 10–17.
- Fedler, A. J., & Ditton, R. B. (1986). A framework for understanding the consumptive orientation of recreational fishermen. *Environmental Management*, 10(2), 221–227. doi: 10.1007/BF01867360
- Finnish Federation for Recreational Fishing. (2020). *Kilpailukalenteri*. [*Angling competition calendar*]. <https://www.vapaa-ajankalastaja.fi/kilpailut/kilpailukalenteri/> (Accessed on 20.8.2021)

- Gallarza, M. G., & Saura, I. G. (2006). Value dimensions, perceived value, satisfaction and loyalty: An investigation of university students' travel behaviour. *Tourism Management*, 27(3), 437–452. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2004.12.002
- Getz, D., & Andersson, T. D. (2010). The event-tourist career trajectory: A study of high-involvement amateur distance runners. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(4), 468–491. doi: 10.1080/15022250.2010.524981
- Getz, D., & McConnell, A. (2011). Serious sport tourism and event travel careers. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25(4), 326–338. doi: 10.1123/jism.25.4.326
- Golden, A. S., Free, C. M., & Jensen, O. P. (2019). Angler preferences and satisfaction in a high-threshold bucket-list recreational fishery. *Fisheries Research*, 220, 105364. doi: 10.1016/j.fishres.2019.105364
- Gould, J., Moore, D. W., McGuire, F., & Stebbins, R. A. (2008). Development of the serious leisure inventory and measure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 40(1), 47–68.
- Graefe, A. R. (1981). Understanding diverse fishing groups: The case of drum fishermen. *Marine Recreational Fisheries*, 6, 69–79.
- Griffiths, S. P., Bryant, J., Raymond, H. F., & Newcombe, P. A. (2017). Quantifying subjective human dimensions of recreational fishing: does good health come to those who bait? *Fish and Fisheries*, 18(1), 171–184. doi: 10.1111/faf.12149
- Hallem, Y., & Barth, I. (2011). Customer-perceived value of medical tourism: An exploratory study - The case of cosmetic surgery in Tunisia. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18(1), 121–129. doi: 10.1375/jhtm.18.1.121
- Holbrook, M. B. (1999). *Consumer Value: A Framework for Analysis and Research*. London: Routledge.
- Holland, S. M., & Ditton, R. B. (1992). Fishing trip satisfaction: A typology of anglers. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 12(1), 28–33. doi: 10.1577/1548-8675(1992)012<0028:ftsato>2.3.co;2
- Jackson, E. L., Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1993). Negotiation of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 15(1), 1–11. doi: 10.1080/01490409309513182
- Kerr, S. J., & Kamke, K. K. (2003). Competitive fishing in freshwaters of North America. *Fisheries*, 28(3), 26–31. doi: 10.1577/1548-8446(2003)28[26:cfifon]2.0.co;2
- Kim, S. S., Lee, C. K., & Klenosky, D. B. (2003). The influence of push and pull factors at Korean national parks. *Tourism Management*, 24(2), 169–180. doi: 10.1016/S0261-5177(02)00059-6
- Knopf, R. C., Driver, B. L., & Bassett, J. R. (1973). Motivations for fishing. *Transactions of the 38th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*, 38, 191–204.
- Komppula, R. (2005). Pursuing customer value in tourism – a rural tourism case-study. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*, 3(2), 83–104.
- Komppula, R., & Gartner, W. C. (2013). Hunting as a travel experience: An auto-ethnographic study of hunting tourism in Finland and the USA. *Tourism Management*, 35, 168–180. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2012.06.014
- Komppula, R., & Suni, J. (2013). Identifying hunting tourist types - an exploratory case study from Finland. *Tourism Review*, 68(1), 48–61. doi: 10.1108/16605371311310075
- Kuehn, D., Luzadis, V., & Brincka, M. (2013). An analysis of the factors influencing fishing participation by resident anglers. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 18(5), 322–339.
- Kuehn, D., Luzadis, V., & Brincka, M. (2017). “I catch whatever’s biting!”: Motivations, constraints, and facilitators of no-preference anglers residing along New York’s Lake Ontario Coast. *Fisheries Research*, 194, 188–196. doi: 10.1016/j.fishres.2017.06.003
- Kyle, G., Norman, W., Jodice, L., Graefe, A., & Marsinko, A. (2007). Segmenting anglers using their consumptive orientation profiles. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 12(2), 115–132. doi: 10.1080/10871200701196066
- Larsen, S. (2007). Aspects of a psychology of the tourist experience. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(1), 7–18. doi: 10.1080/15022250701226014

- Luke. (2015). *The number of recreational anglers is back on a growth path again*. <https://www.luke.fi/en/news/the-number-of-recreational-anglers-is-back-on-a-growth-path-again/> (Accessed on 20.8.2021)
- Luke. (2019). *Vapaa-ajankalastus 2018. [Recreational fishing 2018]*. https://stat.luke.fi/vapaa-ajankalastus-2018_fi (Accessed on 20.8.2021)
- Magee, C., Voyer, M., McIlgorm, A., & Li, O. (2018). Chasing the thrill or just passing the time? Trialing a new mixed methods approach to understanding heterogeneity amongst recreational fishers based on motivations. *Fisheries Research*, 199, 107–118. doi: 10.1016/j.fishres.2017.11.026
- Manfredo, M. J., Driver, B. L., & Tarrant, M. A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: A meta-analysis of the Recreation Experience Preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(3), 188–213.
- Mckean, J. R., Johnson, D., & Taylor, R. G. (2014). Estimating tournament effects on sportfishing demand. *Tourism Economics*, 20(5), 1067–1086. doi: 10.5367/te.2013.0315
- McManus, A., Hunt, W., Storey, J., & White, J. (2011). *Identifying the health and well-being benefits of recreational fishing*. Centre of Excellence for Science, Seafood & Health (CoESSH).
- Meinelt, T., Arlinghaus, R., & Jendrusch, K. (2008). Legislative treatment and current status of competitive fishing in Germany. In Ø. Aas (Ed.), *Global Challenges in Recreational Fisheries* (pp. 254–259). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oh, S., & Syn, S. Y. (2015). Motivations for sharing information and social support in social media: A comparative analysis of Facebook, Twitter, Delicious, YouTube, and Flickr. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(10), 2045–2060. doi: 10.1002/asi.23320
- Perić, M., Vitezić, V., & Badurina, J. Đ. (2019). Business models for active outdoor sport event tourism experiences. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 32, 100561. doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100561
- Pesonen, J., Komppula, R., Kronenberg, C., & Peters, M. (2011). Understanding the relationship between push and pull motivations in rural tourism. *Tourism Review*, 66(3), 32–49. doi: 10.1108/16605371111175311
- Petchenick, J. (2009). *Public awareness of, participation in, and opinions about fishing tournaments in Wisconsin*. Madison: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.
- Prebensen, N. K., Chen, J. S., & Uysal, M. (2014). Co-creation of tourist experience: scope, definition and structure. In *Creating experience value in tourism*. CABI. doi: 10.1079/9781780643489.0001
- Prebensen, N. K., & Xie, J. (2017). Efficacy of co-creation and mastering on perceived value and satisfaction in tourists' consumption. *Tourism Management*, 60, 166–176. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2016.12.001
- Raymore, L. A. (2002). Facilitators to leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(1), 37–51. doi: 10.1080/00222216.2002.11949959
- Ryan, C. (2010). Ways of conceptualizing the tourist experience a review of literature. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 35(1), 37–46. doi: 10.1080/02508281.2010.11081617
- Ryan, C., & Glendon, I. (1998). Application of leisure motivation scale to tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1), 169–184. doi: 10.1016/s0160-7383(97)00066-2
- Sánchez-Fernández, R., & Iniesta-Bonillo, M. Á. (2007). The concept of perceived value: A systematic review of the research. *Marketing Theory*, 7(4), 427–451. doi: 10.1177/1470593107083165
- Schramm Jr, H. L., & Harrison, J. C. (2008). Competitive fishing and its role in recreational fisheries management. In Ø. Aas (Ed.), *Global challenges in recreational fisheries*. (pp. 237–248). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Schroeder, S. A., Fulton, D. C., Currie, L., & Goeman, T. (2006). He said, she said: Gender and angling specialization, motivations, ethics, and behaviors. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 11(5), 301–315. doi: 10.1080/10871200600894928

- Sheth, J. N., Newman, B. I., & Gross, B. L. (1991). Why we buy what we buy: A theory of consumption values. *Journal of Business Research*. doi: 10.1016/0148-2963(91)90050-8
- Skrzypczak, A. R., & Karpiński, E. A. (2020). New insight into the motivations of anglers and fish release practices in view of the invasiveness of angling. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 271(1), 11055. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.11055
- Solstrand, M. V. (2013). Marine angling tourism in Norway and Iceland: Finding balance in management policy for sustainability. *Natural Resources Forum*, 37(2), 113–126. doi: 10.1111/1477-8947.12006
- Stebbins, R. A. (1992). *Amateurs, professionals and serious leisure*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Stebbins, R. A. (2007). *Serious leisure: A perspective for our time*. London: Transaction Publishers.
- Stensland, S. (2010). Fishing rights and supply of salmon angling tourism in Mid-Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(3), 207–230. doi: 10.1080/15022250.2010.495483
- Stensland, S. (2013). Landowners' perception of risk sources and risk management strategies in Norwegian salmon angling tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 13(3), 208–227. doi: 10.1080/15022250.2013.830362
- Stensland, S., & Aas, Ø. (2014). The role of social norms and informal sanctions in catch-and-release angling. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 21, 288–298. doi: 10.1111/fme.12078
- Stensland, S., Aas, Ø., & Mehmetoglu, M. (2017). Understanding Constraints and Facilitators to Salmon Angling Participation: Insights from Structural Equation Modeling. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 22(1), 1–17. doi: 10.1080/10871209.2016.1199073
- Sweeney, J. C., & Soutar, G. N. (2001). Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 77(2), 203–220. doi: 10.1016/S0022-4359(01)00041-0
- Tapachai, N., & Waryszak, R. (2000). An examination of the role of beneficial image in tourist destination selection. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 37–44. doi: 10.1177/004728750003900105
- Turunen, L. (2019). *Fishing as a tourist experience: Finnish recreational fishermen*. University of Eastern Finland.
- Waldo, S., & Paulrud, A. (2012). Obstacles to developing recreational fishing enterprises in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 12(2), 121–139. doi: 10.1080/15022250.2011.633254
- Walls, A., Okumus, F., Wang, Y. (Raymond), & Kwun, D. J.-W. (2011). Understanding the consumer experience: An exploratory study of luxury hotels. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 20(2), 166–197. doi: 10.1080/19368623.2011.536074
- Wilde, G. R., Riechers, R. K., & Ditton, R. B. (1998). Differences in attitudes, fishing motives, and demographic characteristics between tournament and nontournament black bass anglers in Texas. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 18(2), 422–431.
- Williams, P., & Soutar, G. N. (2000). Dimensions of customer value and the tourism experience : An exploratory study faculty of business and public management. *Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference*, 28, 1415–1421.
- Williams, P., & Soutar, G. N. (2009). Value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions in an adventure tourism context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 413–438. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2009.02.002
- Wołos, A., Mioduszevska, H., & Schramm Jr, H. L. (2008). Socio-economic analysis of competitive fishing in Poland. In Ø. Aas (Ed.), *Global Challenges in Recreational Fisheries* (pp. 249–254). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Yuan, Y. H. E., & Wu, C. K. (2008). Relationships Among Experiential Marketing, Experiential Value, and Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 32(3), 387–410. doi: 10.1177/1096348008317392

Received: 20/08/2021

Accepted: 21/01/2022

Coordinating editor: Marko Perić

Appendix A. Questions included in the questionnaire

Angling competition related questions

Have you been to an angling competition event outside your area of residence during the past 24 months?

How many years have you done angling competitively?

How many angling competition days have you gathered during a year?

How many times do you compete during winter period?

How many times do you compete during open water period?

How many times do you travel outside your area of residence for angling competitions?

How many times a year you travel outside your area of residence to a angling competition event? (50-100km)? (over 100km)?

Your favorite angling competition "style" (choose one)

- Ice fishing / Traditional angling / Pier fishing / Trolling / Lure fishing / Fly fishing

Have you been on an angling competition trip in Finland or abroad during last 24 months?

Where have you been to an angling competition trip during last 24 months?

How many days have you spend overnight angling competition trips in Finland or abroad during last 12 months?

On average (euros per person per day), how much money do you use during an overnight angling competition trip at the area of the event for

... accommodation?

... restaurant services?

... fishing gear?

... traveling?

... participation fees?

... baits?

With whom do you mostly do overnight angling competition trips in Finland?

- No companion(s) / Spouse / Family / Friends / Fishing club / Other organisation

Sociodemographic questions

- Gender / Age / Area of residence / Marital status / Education / Annual gross earnings

Value	Statement (importance evaluated on 7-point Likert scale, 1 = Not important at all ... 7 = Very important)
Functional	I mainly fish competitively to get fish for nutrition
Functional	I do not care if the caught fish is wild or farm-raised*
Functional	In an angling competition, I would rather catch one or two big fish than few small ones

Functional	The bigger the fish I catch, the better the angling competition
Functional	I would be happy with the competition even if I would not catch any fish
Functional	An angling competition can be enjoyable even if I do not succeed in the competition
Functional	I must catch fish for the angling competition to be enjoyable
Functional	I must be able to keep the caught fish to be satisfied with a competition
Functional	It is important to me that the arrangements of the competition are equal
Functional	It is important to me that the arrangements of the competition are managed properly
Social	I am happy and proud to tell my friends about my angling competitions
Social	My friends appreciate me based on my angling competition achievements
Social	I like to share my knowledge to others
Social	I like to tell my friends about my angling competition achievements
Social	I like to share pictures about angling competitions on social media and other angling-related forums
Togetherness	I mostly compete in angling to spend time with friends
Togetherness	It is important for me to go to angling competitions with specific friends
Togetherness	I want to teach the angling competition tradition to my family members
Togetherness	I enjoy competitive angling as it is a mutual hobby for my family
Togetherness	It is important for me to compete with my friends in an angling competition
Togetherness	It is important for me to compete with my family in an angling competition
Emotional	Angling competition provides me often with "wow" experiences
Emotional	Connection to nature is an important part of angling competition experience
Emotional	Enjoying solitude is a part of my angling competition experience
Emotional	I like to be in a silent and peaceful location
Emotional	I like to give space for my own thoughts
Emotional	An angling competition just be itself is a boring experience
Emotional	Participating in an angling competition should not be too serious
Emotional	I enjoy the excitement angling competition gives me
Emotional	In 10 years, I will most likely continue my angling competition hobby if my health permits*
Emotional	I sleep better after going to an angling competition
Emotional	My physical health is better because of participating in angling competitions
Emotional	My mental health is better because of participating in angling competitions
Epistemic	I enjoy angling competitions because competitions are a serious hobby*
Epistemic	I like to catch new species when angling competitively
Epistemic	I like to try and learn new methods of competitive angling
Epistemic	I like to participate in angling competitions, because I can learn something new
Epistemic	I am constantly looking for opportunities to fish competitively to increase my experience and improve my skills*
Epistemic	I like to take part in angling competitions that are held in areas which are new to me*
Epistemic	Meeting new people is an important part of my competitive angling hobby*

- Conditional I will look for a new angling competition if for some reason I could not take part in the event I had planned (i.e. the event was cancelled)
 - Conditional Despite the weather and other circumstances, I will take part in an angling competition as I had planned
 - Conditional The distance between angling competition location and home will not affect my participation
 - Conditional I will take part in an angling competition despite the total cost
 - Conditional Angling competition's prize or its monetary value has no meaning to me*
-

Note: * item was removed during PCA.