



Figure 2. Estimates of the structural model.

of *Loyalty to the Event* via *Sport Tourists' Travel Resources* (H3) rather than affecting the loyalty directly (H1). This finding highlights an important role of tourist resources in the relationship and confirms that cocreation of experience is imperative in increasing customer loyalty in the context of sport tourism. Finally, the findings indicated that *Loyalty to the Event* resulted in *Loyalty to the Destination* (H7) and *Loyalty to the Event* mediates the relationship between *Event Attributes* and *Loyalty to the Destination*. In summary, the findings provided that all hypotheses were supported except for H2 and H6.

Discussions and Conclusion

This study contributes to the highlighted gap in the sport tourism literature concerning the consequences of active sport tourists' participation in the joint value cocreation with the event and destination

service providers. To our knowledge, there are no major sport tourism studies that have utilized the concept of value cocreation to explore active sport tourists' loyalty to the event and the destination. Understanding these relationships is imperative, as it can help achieve a competitive advantage for the service providers through sport event tourists' loyalty.

The innovativeness of this study lies in the examination of value cocreation of the sport event tourism experience through an understanding of the sport event tourists' interactions with the event and destination service provider through their travel resources. As described in the literature review, travel resources are a vital part of active sport tourist experiences (Prebensen et al., 2013). Active sport tourists are principal cocreators of value; they are not passive agents, but enthusiastic producers of their own event experience. Of interest is a role of personal resources that played on the

Table 4
Standardized Path Coefficient of the Hypothesized Model

Variable (Hypothesis)	Path Coefficient	<i>t</i> Value	<i>p</i>
Event Attributes→Sport Event Tourists' Travel Resources (H1)	0.55	5.08	<0.01
Event Attributes→Loyalty to the Event (H3)	0.20	3.47	<0.01
Destination Attributes→Loyalty to the Destination (H4)	0.45	8.2	<0.01
Sport Event Tourists' Travel Resources→Loyalty to the Event (H5)	0.49	8.0	<0.01
Loyalty to the Event→Loyalty to the Destination (H7)	0.65	8.6	<0.01

Note. All values were significant.

relationship of event attributes and event loyalty. That time, money, and accommodation positively influenced the level of event loyalty is a critical finding for event organizers. How resources are influencing this is important. Is it that the attributes of the event are high quality, but inexpensive and therefore worth repeating? Or perhaps easy to get to and allows for the sport event tourists to stay with their family—making it an ideal race to return to in the future? Empirical research supports the notion that event loyalty is significantly influenced by sport event tourists' satisfied experiences at the event (Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2010; Kaplanidou et al., 2012). Although this study did not measure satisfaction explicitly, it could be concluded that if a sport event tourist has spent a good deal of time and money training for, traveling to, and participating in the event, then the loyalty toward the event could exist, given it was worth the travel resources spent to participate. As such, the benefit of the event participation outweighs the cost of the travel resources expended thereby enhancing the event loyalty. Event organizers should seek to learn what about their event offerings align with the athlete's travel resources as this could have a major impact on who returns to the event in the future and why. Future research should explore the relationship between event attributes and travel resources and how this influences value cocreation experiences and, subsequently, event loyalty.

That event attributes had a direct effect on event loyalty, was not surprising. Buning and Gibson (2016a), as well as Getz and McConnell (2014), found that event characteristics influenced event loyalty. A well-organized event, reputation of the event, and scenic course were among the event attributes likely to matter most. These elements also add to the value cocreation experience. A well-organized event allows the athlete to compete with efficiency and ease—adding to an overall positive sport event experience. Further, the environmental factors also add to cocreation. For example, an athlete could choose a wetsuit legal triathlon because s/he feels timid about swimming long distances in open water. The wetsuit would add buoyancy to the swimmer, calming his/her fears and improving the overall experience of competing in what can be a daunting environment. Likewise, a different athlete might choose a course with a large elevation

change to add to his/her personal challenge and yet another might choose a location like Cozumel, Mexico for the scenic views during the event. The literature has determined that event attributes matter, but what also appears to be at play is the travel resources available to the athlete and this influence on travel.

Event attributes had a significant effect on the active sport tourist's travel resources. Given the amount of time and money an athlete contributes to preparing for and competing in a sport event, it is not surprising to observe that event attributes influence athlete decision making when they choose and prepare for an event. Although there has been considerable work on constraints to sport event participation (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Gilbert & Hudson, 2000; Godbey et al., 2010), there has been scant studies on how individual travel resources are influenced by the event attributes. Although travel resources are not necessarily limiting, those athletes with limited time and money availability could view them as a constraint. It makes sense that active sport tourists would consider the type of event, what it has to offer, the amount of time and money that would be required to complete, and how that could influence travel resources (Buning & Gibson, 2016a, 2016b; Kaplanidou et al., 2012; Getz & Anderssen, 2010; Getz & McConnell, 2014). This research illustrates the active role that event attributes can play in the creation of active sport tourists' experiences through the sharing and integrating of their resources as one trains and coordinates travel. If one is to spend a good deal of travel resources preparing for and attending the event, then it would make sense that the event attributes would influence this decision. For example, cyclists and triathletes have an additional layer of planning when traveling due to equipment. These athletes must consider the event attributes attached to travel (e.g., expense of traveling with equipment, distance from home, ease of access to event site, transportation options, etc.) because traveling with a bicycle is neither easy nor inexpensive. Although there are (rarely) options to rent a bicycle on location, which could ease the travel conditions, athletes are typically uncomfortable racing on unknown equipment. For event organizers, understanding how the event attributes can impact individual travel resources could enhance the value cocreation

experience for the active sport tourist. For example, event sites that accommodate multiple transportation options could be helpful to the athlete.

Finally, this study showed that event loyalty enhances destination loyalty. This finding is unique in the sport event literature, as it appears to somewhat contradict Kaplanidou et al. (2012), who found event satisfaction did not influence intention to revisit the destination. Although Kaplanidou and her colleagues focused more on event satisfaction and not loyalty, the finding that there was no behavioral influence toward the destination is important to note. Further, Taks et al. (2009) found that athletes were less likely to return to the destination and tended to participate less in tourism activities. The current finding that event loyalty can influence destination loyalty is critical for destination service providers given that other researchers have noted that serious athletes are less likely to interact with the destination (Aicher & Newland, 2017; Green, 2001; Taks et al., 2009). One issue destination marketers must overcome is that athletes loyal to the sport event are more likely to return to the location for the event only, not necessarily the tourism activities of the destination (Kaplanidou, 2010). Therefore, destination marketers should use the event as a leveraging opportunity for the host location (Chalip, 2018). If athletes are willing to return, then this provides excellent opportunities to bundle tourism activities based on the leisure interests of the active sport event participants (Aicher & Newland, 2017; Chalip & McGuirty, 2004). Thus, finding ways to foster destination loyalty using sport events is paramount, especially if the destination uses such sport events in a larger event portfolio to enhance tourism (Ziakas & Costa, 2010). Future research should explore the link between event loyalty and destination loyalty more closely to determine the role of cocreation in strengthening loyalty to the event and subsequently, the destination.

For the progress of research as well as management purposes, more efforts are needed to create a richer body of evidence that could contribute to identifying different factors of active sport tourist experiences within various conditions. Cocreation brings a number of benefits to an organization that can offer a competitive advantage by enhancing customer loyalty (Cossío-Silva et al., 2016; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Feedback is key to

understanding how the cocreation experience adds value and contributes to loyalty to the event and destination service providers (Lusch et al., 2006). Some sport tourism researchers have argued the influence of event loyalty on destination loyalty is not guaranteed (Kaplanidou et al., 2012). However, this study showed the event loyalty is a potential means of enhancing the destination loyalty, but this will not occur in a vacuum. Both event and destination service providers must closely plan and leverage the cocreation process (Chalip & McGuirty, 2004; Grisseemann & Stokburger-Saure, 2012; Taks et al., 2009). As noted above, the leveraging of events should be exploited by destination service providers by bundling destination attributes to extend opportunities for cocreation that may lead to lengthened stays and more spending (Aicher & Newland, 2017; Chalip & McGuirty, 2004).

This research did not explore the entire cocreation process, which may involve other aspects of personal resources and different players. We suggest that future research may identify other stakeholders and examine how service providers, sport tourists, and other stakeholders interact to create value in a sport event tourism context. For this to happen, further research may focus on the development and/or adoption of technology or other resources used by service providers to increase the cocreation and subsequent experience with the event and destination.

References

- Aicher, T. J., & Newland, B. L. (2017). To explore or race? Examining endurance athletes' destination event choices. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 1–15.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411–423.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2017). *Amos 23.0 user's guide*. Amos Development Corporation USA.
- Auh, S., Bell, S., McLeod, C., & Shih, C. (2007). Co-production and customer loyalty in financial services. *Journal of Retailing*, 83(3), 359–370.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1989). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of Academy Marketing Science*, 16, 74–94.
- Bharwani, S., & Jauhari, V. (2013). An exploratory study of competencies required to co-create memorable customer experiences in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(6), 823–843.

- Binkhorst, E., & Den Dekker, T. (2009). Agenda for co-creation tourism experience research. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *18*(2–3), 311–327.
- Bull, C. J. (2006). Racing cyclists as sports tourists: The experiences and behaviours of a case study group of cyclists in East Kent, England. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, *11*(3–4), 259–274.
- Buning, R. J., Aicher, T. J., & Newland, B. L. (2018). *The influence of an individual's social world status on event participation and satisfaction*. Presentation at the conference of the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) Conference, Halifax, Canada.
- Buning, R. J., & Gibson, H. J. (2016a). Exploring the trajectory of active-sport-event travel careers: A social worlds perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, *30*, 265–281.
- Buning, R. J., & Gibson, H. J. (2016b). The role of travel conditions in cycling tourism: Implications for destination and event management. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 1–19.
- Campos, A. C., Mendes, J., Oom do Valle, P., & Scott, N. (2016). Co-creation experiences: Attention and memorability. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *33*, 1309–1336.
- Carù, A., & Cova, B. (2007). *Consuming experience*. Routledge.
- Chalip, L. (2018). Trading legacy for leverage. In I. Brittain, J. Bocarro, T. Byers, & K. Swart (Eds.), *Legacies and mega events: Fact or fairy tales?* (pp. 25–42). Routledge.
- Chalip, L., & McGuirty, J. (2004). Building sport events with the host destination. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, *9*(3), 267–282.
- Cossío-Silva, F. J., Revilla-Camacho, M. Á., Vega-Vázquez, M., & Palacios-Florencio, B. (2016). Value co-creation and customer loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(5), 1621–1625.
- Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, *9*, 119–127.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, *52*, 281–302.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*, 39–50.
- 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.
- 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.
- Gilbert, D., & Hudson, S. (2000). Tourism demand constraints: A skiing participation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *27*(4), 906–925.
- Godey, G., Carwford, D. W., & Shen, X. S. (2010). Assessing hierarchical leisure constraints theory after two decades. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *42*(1), 111–134.
- Green, B. C. (2001). Leveraging subculture and identity to promote sport events. *Sport Management Review*, *4*(1), 1–19.
- Green, B. C., & Jones, I. (2005). Serious leisure, social identity and sport tourism. *Sport in Society*, *8*(2), 164–181.
- Grissemann, U. S., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2012). Customer co-creation of travel services: The role of company support and customer satisfaction with the co-creation performance. *Tourism Management*, *33*(6), 1483–1492.
- Gyimóthy, S., & Larson, M. (2015). Social media co-creation strategies: The 3Cs. *Event Management*, *19*(3), 331–348.
- Hemmatinezhad, M. A., Nia, F. R., & Kalar, A. M. (2010). The study of effective factors on the motivation of tourists participating in sport events. *Ovidius University Annals, Physical Education and Sport/Science, Movement and Health Series*, *10*(2), 356–361.
- Ihamäki, P. (2012). Geocachers: The creative tourism experience. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, *3*(3), 152–175.
- Kaplanidou, K. (2010). Active sport tourist: Sport event image consideration. *Tourism Analysis*, *15*, 381–386.
- 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.
- Kaplanidou, K., Jordan, J. S., Funk, D., & Ridinger, L. L. (2012). Recurring sport events and destination image perceptions: Impact on active sport tourist behavioral intentions and place attachment. *Journal of Sport Management*, *26*(3), 237–248.
- Kaplanidou, K., & Vogt, C. (2010). The meaning and measurement of a sport event experience among active sport tourists. *Journal of Sport Management*, *24*(5), 544–566.
- Kelley, S. W., & Turley, L. W. (2001). Consumer perceptions of service quality attributes at sporting events. *Journal of Business Research*, *54*, 161–166.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Li, X. R., & Petrick, J. F. (2008). Examining the antecedents of brand loyalty from an investment model perspective. *Journal of Travel Research*, *47*(1), 25–34.
- Lusch, R., & Vargo, S. (2006). Service dominant logic: Reactions, reflections, and refinements. *Marketing Theory*, *6*(3), 281–288.
- Lusch, R. F., Vargo, S. L., & Malter, A. (2006). Marketing as service-exchange: Taking a leadership role in global marketing management. *Organizational Dynamics*, *35*(3), 264–278.
- McDonald, H., & Karg, A. J. (2014). Managing co-creation in professional sports: The antecedents and consequences of ritualized spectator behavior. *Sport Management Review*, *17*(3), 292–309.
- Mathis, E. F., Kim, H. L., Uysal, M., Sirgy, J. M., & Prebensen, N. K. (2016). The effect of co-creation experience on outcome variable. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *57*, 62–75.

- Newland, B. L., & Aicher, T. J. (2018). Exploring sport participants' event and destination choices. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 22(2), 131–149.
- Payne, A. F., Storbacka, K., & Frow, P. (2008). Managing the co-creation of value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36, 83–96.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). *The future of competition: Co-creating unique value with customers*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Prebensen, N. K., & Foss, L. (2011). Coping & co-creating in tourist experiences. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13, 54–67.
- Prebensen, N. K., Vittersø, J., & Dahl, T. (2013). Value co-creation. Significance of tourist resources. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42, 240–261.
- Prebensen, N. K., Woo, E., & Uysal, M. S. (2014). Experience value: Antecedents and consequences. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 910–928.
- 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.
- Shaw, G., Bailey, A., & Williams, A. (2011). Aspects of service-dominant logic and its implications for tourism management: Examples from the hotel industry. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 207–214.
- Suntikul, W., & Jachna, T. (2016). The co-creation/place attachment nexus. *Tourism Management*, 52, 276–286.
- Taks, M., Chalip, L., Green, B. C., Kesenne, S., & Martyn, S. (2009). Factors affecting repeat visitation and flow-on tourism as sources of event strategy sustainability. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 14(2–3), 121–142.
- Thomas, K., & Clifford, S. (2017). Validity and mechanical Turk: An assessment of exclusion methods and interactive experiments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 77, 184–197.
- Uhrich, S. (2014). Exploring customer-to-customer value co-creation platforms and practices in team sports. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14(1), 25–49.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1–17.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2008). Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 1–10.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2014). Institutions and axioms: An extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44(1), 5–23.
- Yoshida, M., & James, J. D. (2010). Customer satisfaction with game and service experiences: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Sport Management*, 24, 338–361.
- Zhang, X., & Chen, R. (2008). Examining the mechanism of the value co-creation with customers. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 116(2), 242–250.
- Ziakas, V., & Costa, C. A. (2010). Event portfolio and multi-purpose development: Establishing the conceptual grounds. *Sport Management Review*, 14(4), 409–423.