

# **OGUAA JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES (JOSS)**

**Volume 6    No. 1    May, 2011**



***A PUBLICATION BY  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST  
CAPE COAST, GHANA***

## Sports Tourists' Satisfaction with the CAN 2008 Continental Sporting Event in Ghana

Ishmael Mensah<sup>1</sup> and Joseph Abanga<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management,  
University of Cape Coast,

### Abstract

*Satisfaction is essential for the successful marketing of events, yet most studies on events have been restricted to measuring economic impact. This study examined sports tourists' satisfaction with the African Cup of Nations (CAN 2008) tournament in Ghana as well as identified some of the factors that influenced their satisfaction. A total of 428 sports tourists from participating countries were purposively sampled and given questionnaires to self-administer. Secondary data on the performance of the various participating teams was obtained from internet sources. The results of the study suggest that respondents were generally satisfied with the event though they were more satisfied with the sociological aspects of the event. Ticketing, pricing and dissemination of information had the lowest ratings. The study has implications for both the management of future events and for research.*

**Keywords:** CAN 2008, Satisfaction, Sports Tourism, Event, Marketing

### Introduction

Governments of most tourist destinations have recognised the importance of sports as a tourism endeavour and are aggressively promoting sports tourism. As a result, the right to host mega events like the Olympic Games and FIFA World Cup is preceded by intense lobbying and bidding. A 1994 European Commission Report on the European

Community and Sport estimated that the sports industry is responsible for 2.5 percent of world trade (Commonwealth Australia, 2000). Also, growth rates for the sport tourism industry are estimated at about 10 percent per annum (Hudson, 2003).

The government of Ghana invested substantially into the successful hosting of the African Cup of Nations (CAN). Modern stadia were built in Takoradi and Tamale whilst the ones in Accra and Kumasi have been renovated, all at the cost of over \$200 million. This placed enormous responsibility on the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) to stage the event successfully in order to justify the huge financial investments. But the success of the event also depends on the satisfaction to be derived by the attendees.

Glyptis (1991) believes the expanding market and opportunities in tourism and sport businesses are indications of the need for studies on sports tourism. However, most studies on sports tourism have focused on its economic impacts (Ritchie and Smith, 1991; Brunet, 1996; Dobson *et al.*, 1997 and Gratton *et al.*, 2000). Indeed most governments and local authorities commit substantial resources to the staging of events because of the anticipated economic benefits as asserted by McMahan-Beattie and Yeoman, (2004:188). According to these researchers, "The economic impact of major sports events is of critical importance when it comes to justifying the investments made". The overemphasis on economic impacts has the tendency of compromising the quality of such events. However, for sports tourists to continue attending subsequent events at the destinations, they have to be satisfied with previous events. This study therefore aims at examining sports tourists' satisfaction with the CAN 2008 sporting event. It also looks at the factors influencing sports tourists' satisfaction with the event.

### Literature Review

Satisfaction is viewed generally as a post-purchase comparison of perceived performance of a product with expectations (Herrmann *et al.*,

2000; Lovelock *et al.*, 2001). It has also been described as an evaluative, affective or emotional response to a consumptive experience (Shonk, 2006). However, Tse and Wilton (1988) are of the view that consumer dissatisfaction is only a function of the actual performance, irrespective of consumers' expectations. This is because consumers evaluate each transaction on its own terms without using their expectations as a reference point.

Satisfaction, which has been closely linked with value (Hollowell, 1996; Woodall, 2003), has also been defined severally. Fornell (1992) describes it as an overall evaluation of a purchase. It is also a judgement that a product or service feature, or the product or service itself, provides a pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfilment" (Oliver, 1997:13). Satisfaction has further been described as the psychological outcome of experiencing the service (MacKay and Crompton, 1990). There have also been attempts to distinguish between satisfaction with the consumption of goods and the consumption of services, because of the role of the consumer in the latter (Lovelock, 1991). Moreover, measuring tourists' satisfaction with a destination (which is the case of the CAN 2008 event), is conceptually different from measuring satisfaction at the transaction specific level (Foster, 1997). This is because the destination is an amalgam of services, facilities, products and infrastructure which must be effectively combined to meet the needs of the tourist.

Satisfaction has generally been viewed on two levels; transaction-specific level and cumulative level (Johnson *et al.*, 1995). The cumulative satisfaction is seen as the sum of the relative importance and the level of satisfaction experienced on all the single attributes (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). The cumulative satisfaction method is suitable for a study of a special event like the CAN 2008 because tourists' satisfaction is not based on a single expenditure item but a combination of the football matches, accommodation, transportation, entertainment, social interactions, food and other ancillary services such as ticketing and information dissemination.

Tourist satisfaction is important to the successful marketing of tourist products (Crompton and Mackay, 1997; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000). This is because it leads to customer loyalty (Fornell 1992; Musa *et al.*, 2004). It also results in increased positive word-of-mouth promotion, increased market share and increased profits (Fornell, 1992; Anderson and Sullivan, 1993; Kotler, 1994).

Some conceptual frameworks have been proposed to explain tourist satisfaction and these include expectation/disconfirmation (Francken & Van Raaij, 1981; Chon, 1989), equity (Fisk & Young, 1985; Oliver & Swan, 1989), norm (Cadotte, Woodruff, & Jenkins, 1987), and perceived overall performance (Tse & Wilton, 1988, Yoon and Uysal, 2005). In addition, Pizam and Ellis (1999) in their review of the literature identified other theories on satisfaction. These are assimilation of cognitive dissonance, contrast, assimilation-contrast, attribution, comparison-level, generalized negativity and value-precept. According to the expectation/disconfirmation models, consumers have expectations about a product which they compare with actual performance. There is positive disconfirmation if the actual performance is better than their expectations and negative disconfirmation if the actual performance is worse than expectations. The equity models suggest that people are motivated when the costs of acquiring an experience equal the benefits to be derived. The perceived overall performance looks at the actual performance of a product or service without reference to consumers' expectations or their past experiences. This model is useful when tourists do not know about the situation at the destination such as in the case of the CAN tournament which is rotated among African countries every two years and no particular country hosts it two times in succession. This study therefore measures the perceived overall performance of the CAN 2008 event at the cumulative satisfaction level.

Though numerous studies have been done on customer's satisfaction, little work has been done on customer satisfaction in the context of sports tourism. Mullins (1985) identified club identification and

the win/lose phenomenon as two constructs that influence the satisfaction of sport fans. Madrigal (1995) tested a model of the cognitive and affective determinants of fan satisfaction with sport events. The model's cognitive variables were team identification, quality of opponent and expectancy disconfirmation whilst the affective variables were basking in reflected glory and enjoyment. These studies were, however, undertaken in the realm of sports psychology and marketing rather than sports tourism.

Wakefield and Blodgett (1994) on the other hand examined the effects of sport facility, perceived crowding, excitement and enduring involvement on customer satisfaction and repatronage intentions. Leeuwen *et al.* (2002) questioned the ability of the disconfirmation of expectancy model (DEM) to capture the complexity of sport customer satisfaction. This is because sports marketing is different from the marketing of other goods and services. They also criticized Madrigal and Blodgett's models as being narrow in focus because whilst the former explored satisfaction arising from the game, the latter focused on satisfaction derived from the sports facility. They subsequently proposed the Sports Spectator Satisfaction Model (SSSM) which looks at satisfaction arising from both the game and non-game components of the spectator services. However, these studies did not look at satisfaction at the cumulative level in the context of the tourist destination hosting a mega event.

Shonk (2006) tested a multi-dimensional model of service quality applicable to travelling sports spectators to a major league All-Star sporting event in the United States. He evaluated their overall satisfaction of the event based on their perceptions of four major quality dimensions namely, access quality, accommodation quality, venue quality and contest quality. The study indicated that the most important dimension to the respondents was the quality of the contest itself. However, this study also did not explore the factors that influence sports tourists' satisfaction with the event.

## Methodology

Data for this study was collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were elicited from people attending the event through a survey from the 8<sup>th</sup> of January 2008 to the 10<sup>th</sup> of February 2008. It was not possible to get a sample frame of people attending the event since they did not pre-register. There was no data on people attending the event except a projection by the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) of CAN 2008 which placed the number of expected attendees at one million (Statesman, 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2007; Africanews, 21<sup>st</sup> November, 2007). In view of this, a non-probability sampling method was employed. Specifically, the purposive method was used to sample attendees for the study. Respondents were approached either after a match or at their hotels and with their consent, questionnaires were handed over to them to be completed. To eliminate the incidence of double or multiple responses which was likely to occur in an event situation, respondents were first asked if they had already completed one of the questionnaires. Also, each Field Assistant was to target tourists from a particular country and had to identify people from those countries before handing over the questionnaires to them. Following Neirotti *et al.* (2001) and Madrigal (1995) who in a related study considered sample sizes of 400 and 232 respectively, the sample size of 565 for this study was considered appropriate (Table 1); however, 428 completed questionnaires could be retrieved, representing a response rate of 75.8%.

Table 1: Sample Size of Respondents

| Group and Venue | Country      | Sample | Response |
|-----------------|--------------|--------|----------|
| A<br>Accra      | Guinea       | 40     | 36       |
|                 | Namibia      | 30     | 16       |
|                 | Morocco      | 35     | 33       |
|                 | Ghana        | 60     | 56       |
|                 | Nigeria      | 60     | 55       |
| B<br>Sekondi    | Ivory Coast  | 40     | 38       |
|                 | Mali         | 30     | 16       |
|                 | Benin        | 30     | 17       |
|                 | Egypt        | 30     | 22       |
| C<br>Kumasi     | Cameroun     | 30     | 24       |
|                 | Sudan        | 30     | 27       |
|                 | Zambia       | 30     | 29       |
|                 | Tunisia      | 30     | 10       |
| D<br>Tamale     | Senegal      | 30     | 29       |
|                 | South Africa | 30     | 12       |
|                 | Angola       | 30     | 8        |
| Total           |              | 565    | 428      |

Questionnaires were the main instruments used for the study. Respondents had to indicate their satisfaction with various aspects of the event (hospitality, entertainment, information etc.) on a Likert scale. The original Likert scale by Likert (1970) ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. For this study, it was on a scale of 1-5 (1= poor - 5= Excellent) so that respondents level of satisfaction could be determined. The questionnaire also sought information on respondents' travel characteristics and socio-demographic characteristics. Aside the above information, data relating to the performance of the various national teams such as goal differences, team progression and FIFA ranking were



obtained from secondary sources such as FIFA.com and MTNfootball.com. In view of the fact that a large number of the participating countries were Francophone (Guinea, Morocco, Ivory Coast, Mali, Benin, Cameroon, Tunisia and Senegal), the questionnaire was translated into French for the benefit of those who could not read and write English because the questionnaires were to be self-administered.

The instrument was pre-tested during a local premiership match between Kessben FC and Tema Youth at the Robert Mensah Sports Stadium in Cape Coast, which was not one of the venues for the tournament. A total of 25 sports fans were purposively selected to complete the questionnaire. This afforded the researchers the opportunity to sharpen the instrument for the actual survey. For the actual survey, a total of ten undergraduate students were trained as field assistants. The actual fieldwork started after the first matches had been played and ended after the final match had been played.

## Findings

### *Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents*

From Table 2, it can be concluded that the respondents were relatively young, with ages mostly within the 30-49 age group. More than half of the respondents (54.2%) were within this age category with only six percent aged 50 and above. They were predominantly males (80.8%) which indicates that football matches in Africa are mostly patronized by young men. In terms of marital status, the proportion of those who were married, divorced or widowed (ever married) to singles was almost at par. The former formed 51.6 percent while the latter were 48.4 percent. The respondents were fairly well educated as about three-fourth of them (75.9%) had either completed or were in tertiary institutions such as universities, polytechnics and training colleges. In terms of religious affiliation, 59.6 percent were Christians whilst 38.1 percent were Moslems. This was expected since these are the two predominant religions in Africa.

A greater majority of the respondents (79.9%) were employed in various professions though 20.1 percent were unemployed. Apart from the students, a sizeable number of the respondents were pursuing careers in the media, business, finance and administration, artisanship and education.

**Table 2: Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

| Characteristic            | Frequency<br>n =428 | Percent |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------|
| <b>Age</b>                |                     |         |
| Under 29                  | 170                 | 39.7    |
| 30-49                     | 232                 | 54.2    |
| 50+                       | 26                  | 6.1     |
| <b>Sex</b>                |                     |         |
| Male                      | 346                 | 80.8    |
| Female                    | 82                  | 19.2    |
| <b>Marital Status</b>     |                     |         |
| Ever married              | 221                 | 51.6    |
| Single                    | 207                 | 48.4    |
| <b>Level of Education</b> |                     |         |
| Primary                   | 10                  | 2.3     |
| Secondary                 | 93                  | 21.7    |
| Tertiary                  | 325                 | 75.9    |
| <b>Religion</b>           |                     |         |
| Christian                 | 255                 | 59.6    |
| Moslem                    | 163                 | 38.1    |
| Other                     | 10                  | 2.3     |
| <b>Employment</b>         |                     |         |
| Employed                  | 342                 | 79.9    |
| Unemployed                | 86                  | 20.1    |

---

|                            |     |      |
|----------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>Occupation</b>          |     |      |
| Media                      | 64  | 14.9 |
| Business                   | 49  | 11.5 |
| Finance and administration | 61  | 14.3 |
| Artisan                    | 30  | 7.0  |
| Education                  | 28  | 6.5  |
| Civil/government           | 26  | 6.1  |
| Sports                     | 21  | 4.9  |
| Health                     | 22  | 5.1  |
| Tourism & entertainment    | 20  | 4.7  |
| Student                    | 82  | 19.2 |
| Other                      | 25  | 5.8  |
| <b>National Language</b>   |     |      |
| Anglophone                 | 168 | 39.3 |
| Francophone                | 160 | 37.4 |
| Arabic                     | 92  | 21.5 |
| Portuguese                 | 8   | 1.9  |
| <b>Geographic Region</b>   |     |      |
| Western Africa             | 271 | 63.3 |
| Northern Africa            | 92  | 21.5 |
| Southern Africa            | 65  | 15.2 |

---

The event attracted a large number of students (19.2%) since schools and universities were on recess and media practitioners (14.9%) since they were also covering the event for their organizations. These findings coincide with findings by Gibson, (1994); Attle, (1996); and Nogawa *et al.*, (1996) that sports tourists are likely to be males, young, highly educated and employed full time. Also, the event attracted almost the same number

of Anglophones and Francophones, representing 39.3 percent and 37.4 percent respectively. Only 1.9 percent was Lusophone since Angola was the only Portuguese-speaking country which qualified for the tournament coupled with the fact that few of their supporters attended the tournament. Geographically, most of the respondents (63.3%) were from the western part of Africa due to the fact that most of the countries that qualified for the tournament were from this part of the continent. Northern Africans and Southern Africans represented 21.5 percent and 15.2 percent respectively. East and Central Africans were not represented because countries from that region did not qualify for the tournament. Though Cameroon is politically a central African country, it has been placed among the West African countries because it is geographically located in the west of Africa which eases analysis.

### *Travel Characteristics*

Table 3 suggests that most of the participants (69.2%) were attending a CAN tournament for the first time and travelled in groups with an average size of nine. Indeed, about a quarter (26.6%) attended the event alone. Nearly half (48.6%) of the respondents had planned to stay for the entire three-week duration of the event with only 4.2 percent indicating that they would stay for as long as their national team progresses. More than half of the participants (57.7%) stayed in hotels and guest houses during the event. However, about half of those who stayed in hotels (26.9%) had their meals from those hotels. Restaurants and chop bars were the main sources of food for participants (37.1%) but 28.5 percent prepared their own food. In terms of transportation to and from the match venues, rented vehicles and taxis were the most patronized, accounting for 36.2 percent and 22 percent respectively of the total means of transportation used. A marginal majority of respondents (42.1%) did not rely on travel intermediaries, preferring to make their own arrangements whilst 41.8 percent indicated that their trip was arranged by the groups or associations they belonged to.

**Table 3: Travel Characteristics of Respondents**

| Variable                           | Frequency<br><i>n</i> = 428 | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| <b>Participation in CAN events</b> |                             |            |
| First time                         | 296                         | 69.2       |
| More than once                     | 132                         | 30.8       |
| <b>Size of travel group</b>        |                             |            |
| Alone                              | 114                         | 26.6       |
| 2 - 10                             | 134                         | 31.3       |
| 11-19                              | 51                          | 11.9       |
| 20+                                | 129                         | 30.1       |
| <b>Length-of-stay</b>              |                             |            |
| 1 week                             | 57                          | 13.3       |
| 2 weeks                            | 74                          | 17.3       |
| 3 weeks                            | 208                         | 48.6       |
| 1 month +                          | 71                          | 16.6       |
| As national team progresses        | 18                          | 4.2        |
| <b>Accommodation arrangements</b>  |                             |            |
| Friends and relatives              | 70                          | 16.4       |
| Hostel                             | 111                         | 25.9       |
| Hotel/Guest House                  | 247                         | 57.7       |
| <b>Food arrangements</b>           |                             |            |
| Restaurant/Chop Bar                | 159                         | 37.1       |
| Hotel                              | 113                         | 26.4       |
| Stands                             | 34                          | 7.9        |
| Prepare own food                   | 122                         | 28.5       |
| <b>Means of transportation</b>     |                             |            |
| Private/own car                    | 85                          | 19.9       |
| Taxi                               | 94                          | 22.0       |
| Public Bus                         | 72                          | 16.8       |
| Rented Bus/Car                     | 155                         | 36.2       |
| Aeroplane                          | 22                          | 5.1        |
| <b>Travel arrangement</b>          |                             |            |
| Package Tour                       | 69                          | 16.1       |
| Personal (own) arrangement         | 180                         | 42.1       |
| Group/Association arrangement      | 179                         | 42.1       |

*Satisfaction with the CAN 2008 Event*

In order to determine their level of satisfaction with the CAN 2008 event, respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with various aspects of the event on a scale of 1-5 (1= poor, 5= excellent). The average ratings ranged from good to very good as indicated on Table 4, showing a general satisfaction with the event. Aspects of the event which received the highest (very good) ratings were hospitality (3.87), matches (3.86) and social interactions (3.64). Aspects of the event which received the lowest (good) average ratings were ticketing (2.88), cost of participation and prices (3.05), and provision of information on the event and signage (3.10).

**Table 4: Respondents' Level of Satisfaction with the Ghana CAN 2008 event**

| Aspect of Event             | Percentage of Respondents |             |             |            |            | Mean        | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|--------------------|
|                             | Excellent                 | Very Good   | Good        | Average    | Poor       |             |                    |
| Food                        | 18.5                      | 31.3        | 32.0        | 12.0       | 6.3        | 3.44        | 1.11114            |
| Hospitality                 | 38.1                      | 29.3        | 18.3        | 10.2       | 4.0        | 3.87        | 1.15096            |
| Accommodation               | 11.5                      | 37.0        | 31.7        | 14.3       | 5.5        | 3.35        | 1.03621            |
| Transportation              | 13.1                      | 31.1        | 36.7        | 15.6       | 3.4        | 3.35        | 1.00432            |
| Matches                     | 30.2                      | 37.1        | 22.7        | 8.3        | 1.7        | 3.86        | 0.99853            |
| Social interactions         | 25.6                      | 32.3        | 26.8        | 10.8       | 4.4        | 3.64        | 1.10864            |
| Entertainment               | 21.0                      | 27.2        | 30.4        | 16.0       | 5.4        | 3.42        | 1.14624            |
| Cost/prices                 | 12.4                      | 23.3        | 30.2        | 25.0       | 9.2        | 3.05        | 1.15982            |
| Spectator facilities        | 21.1                      | 26.0        | 35.4        | 13.3       | 4.2        | 3.47        | 1.09105            |
| Ticketing                   | 11.2                      | 21.7        | 27.5        | 22.9       | 16.8       | 2.88        | 1.24614            |
| Information/signage         | 12.0                      | 27.6        | 31.3        | 16.4       | 12.7       | 3.10        | 1.19239            |
| <b>Overall satisfaction</b> | <b>18.7</b>               | <b>42.1</b> | <b>28.6</b> | <b>9.5</b> | <b>1.2</b> | <b>3.68</b> | <b>0.92443</b>     |

*Note: Respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the various elements of the events on a scale of 1-5 (1 = poor, 2 = average, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent)*

From Table 4, it appears respondents were less satisfied with the cost of participating in the event, issuance of match tickets and information dissemination. Ticketing for instance, was rated by 16.8 percent of respondents as poor whilst 11.2 percent rated it as excellent. On the other hand, most respondents were satisfied with the level of hospitality, quality of matches and the opportunities for social interactions. More than a third (38.1%) of the respondents rated hospitality as excellent and 29.3 percent also rated it as very good, with only 4% indicating it was poor. Also, 30.2 percent and 37.1 percent of respondents rated the matches as excellent and very good respectively with only 1.7 percent rating it as poor.

#### *Satisfaction by characteristics of respondents and performance of their teams*

In order to determine what influences sports tourists' satisfaction with a mega sporting event like CAN, the chi-square test of significance was used to determine if there is any relationship between satisfaction, socio-demographic characteristics, travel characteristics and performance of their national teams. The chi-square results are presented on Tables 5, 6 and 7.

**Table 5: Relationship between satisfaction and socio-demographic characteristics**

| Variable                  | Very          |          |          |             |          | $\chi^2$<br>(P-Value) |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|
|                           | Excellent (%) | Good (%) | Good (%) | Average (%) | Poor (%) |                       |
| <b>Sex</b>                |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Male                      | 18.6          | 41.0     | 28.6     | 10.3        | 1.5      | (0.448)               |
| Female                    | 19.5          | 48.1     | 27.3     | 5.2         | 0.0      |                       |
| <b>Age</b>                |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Less than 20 years        | 23.8          | 42.1     | 25.0     | 7.9         | 1.2      | (0.456)               |
| 30-49 years               | 14.2          | 42.2     | 31.1     | 11.1        | 1.3      |                       |
| 50 years and above        | 20.0          | 48.0     | 24.0     | 8.0         | 0.0      |                       |
| <b>Marital status</b>     |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Ever married              | 14.8          | 42.6     | 30.6     | 11.1        | 0.9      | (0.285)               |
| Single                    | 22.0          | 42.5     | 26.0     | 8.0         | 1.5      |                       |
| <b>Level of education</b> |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Primary                   | 26.8          | 37.5     | 21.4     | 12.5        | 1.8      | (0.654)               |
| Secondary                 | 19.4          | 37.5     | 30.6     | 11.1        | 1.4      |                       |
| Tertiary                  | 16.7          | 44.9     | 28.6     | 8.7         | 1.0      |                       |
| <b>Religion</b>           |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Christian                 | 20.0          | 45.3     | 25.3     | 7.8         | 1.6      | (0.003*)              |
| Moslem                    | 14.6          | 36.9     | 35.0     | 13.4        | 0.0      |                       |
| Other                     | 30.0          | 60.0     | 0.0      | 0.0         | 10.0     |                       |
| <b>Geographic region</b>  |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Western Africa            | 21.6          | 43.1     | 28.6     | 5.6         | 1.1      | (0.026*)              |
| Northern Africa           | 14.4          | 38.9     | 26.7     | 18.9        | 1.1      |                       |
| Southern Africa           | 12.5          | 42.2     | 31.3     | 12.5        | 1.6      |                       |
| <b>Employment status</b>  |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Employed                  | 18.3          | 42.5     | 27.8     | 10.1        | 1.2      | (0.851)               |
| Unemployed                | 21.4          | 39.3     | 31.0     | 7.1         | 1.2      |                       |
| <b>National Language</b>  |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| English                   | 19.9          | 46.4     | 26.5     | 6.6         | 0.6      | (0.007*)              |
| French                    | 20.6          | 38.8     | 31.9     | 7.5         | 1.3      |                       |
| Arabic                    | 14.4          | 38.9     | 26.7     | 18.9        | 1.1      |                       |
| Portuguese                | 0.0           | 57.1     | 28.6     | 0.0         | 14.3     |                       |

\*Significant at  $p < 0.05$



Table 5 presents the respondents' overall satisfaction with the event and their socio-demographics. There was no significant relationship between most of the socio-demographic characteristics and respondents' overall satisfaction with the event with the exception of religion ( $p = 0.003$ ), geographic region ( $p = 0.026$ ) and national language ( $p = 0.007$ ).

From Table 5, Christians appeared to be more satisfied than Moslems. Whilst 20 percent and 45.3 percent of the Christians rated the entire event as excellent and very good respectively, 14.6 percent and 36.9 percent of the Moslems rated it as such. Also, West Africans seemed to be more satisfied than those from North and Southern Africa. 21.6 percent of West Africans, 14.4 percent of North Africans and 12.5 percent of Southern Africans rated the event as excellent. This appears to reflect the performance of their national teams since three West African Teams (Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana) were in the finals. Moreover, the Lusophone were the least satisfied since 14.3 percent rated the event as poor compared with 1.1 percent of Arabic, 1.3 percent of Francophones and 0.6 percent of Anglophones who did like wise.

**Table 6: Relationship between satisfaction and travel characteristics**

| Variable                  | Very          |          |          |             |          | $\chi^2$<br>(P-Value) |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|
|                           | Excellent (%) | Good (%) | Good (%) | Average (%) | Poor (%) |                       |
| <b>Travel arrangement</b> |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Package tour              | 30.2          | 36.5     | 27.0     | 6.3         | 0.0      |                       |
| Personal arrangement      | 17.8          | 43.8     | 30.1     | 7.1         | 1.2      |                       |
| Group arrangement         | 14.6          | 45.6     | 26.3     | 12.3        | 1.2      | (0.434)               |
| <b>Food arrangement</b>   |               |          |          |             |          |                       |
| Restaurant/Chop Bar       | 21.1          | 36.2     | 30.9     | 9.9         | 2.0      |                       |
| Hotel                     | 20.5          | 42.9     | 25.9     | 10.7        | 0.0      |                       |
| Stand                     | 12.5          | 37.5     | 37.5     | 12.5        | 0.0      |                       |
| Prepare own food          | 17.2          | 50.0     | 25.0     | 6.9         | 0.9      | (0.729)               |

|                                    |      |      |      |      |     |          |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|----------|
| <b>Accommodation arrangement</b>   |      |      |      |      |     |          |
| Friends and relatives              | 26.9 | 44.8 | 17.9 | 7.5  | 3.0 |          |
| Hostel                             | 19.8 | 41.5 | 32.1 | 6.6  | 0.0 |          |
| Hotel/Guest House                  | 16.0 | 42.0 | 30.3 | 10.8 | 0.9 | (0.141)  |
| <b>Means of transport</b>          |      |      |      |      |     |          |
| Private/own car                    | 12.2 | 37.8 | 34.1 | 12.2 | 3.7 |          |
| Taxi                               | 19.5 | 44.8 | 27.6 | 6.9  | 1.1 |          |
| Public Bus                         | 21.5 | 46.2 | 23.1 | 9.2  | 0.0 |          |
| Rented Bus                         | 21.7 | 43.3 | 28.0 | 7.0  | 0.0 |          |
| Aeroplane                          | 4.8  | 28.6 | 12.9 | 23.8 | 0.0 | (0.064)  |
| <b>Length of stay</b>              |      |      |      |      |     |          |
| 1 Week                             | 15.7 | 43.1 | 39.2 | 2.0  | 0.0 |          |
| 2 Weeks                            | 20.0 | 40.0 | 29.2 | 10.8 | 0.0 |          |
| 3 Weeks                            | 20.0 | 42.1 | 26.8 | 10.0 | 1.1 |          |
| 1 Month and beyond                 | 19.4 | 44.8 | 25.4 | 7.5  | 3.0 |          |
| As team progresses                 | 11.8 | 17.6 | 29.4 | 41.2 | 0.0 | (0.17)   |
| <b>Participation in CAN events</b> |      |      |      |      |     |          |
| First time                         | 19.7 | 43.3 | 29.8 | 6.6  | 0.7 |          |
| More than once                     | 17.1 | 38.8 | 27.1 | 15.5 | 1.6 | (0.054)  |
| <b>Size of travel group</b>        |      |      |      |      |     |          |
| Alone                              | 23.0 | 38.9 | 33.6 | 3.5  | 0.9 |          |
| 2-10                               | 16.7 | 43.6 | 29.2 | 9.1  | 1.5 |          |
| 11-19                              | 20.0 | 37.1 | 22.9 | 20.0 | 0.0 |          |
| 20 and above                       | 12.5 | 43.8 | 12.5 | 31.3 | 0.0 | (0.028*) |

\*Significant at  $p < 0.05$

Though there was no significant relationship between satisfaction with the entire event and most of the travel characteristics of respondents, there was a significant relationship between size of travel group and

satisfaction with the event ( $p = 0.028$ ). From table 6, those who were not tied to any group appeared to be more satisfied than those belonging to larger groups. Also those who had attended previous events in different countries appeared to be less satisfied since 16 percent and 1.6 percent of them rated the event as average and poor respectively whilst about seven percent and 0.7 percent of those who were attending the event for the first time rated it as such.

**Table 7: Relationship between Satisfaction and Team Performance**

| Variable                    | Excellent (%) | Very Good (%) | Good (%) | Average (%) | Poor (%) | $\chi^2$ (P-Value) |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|-------------|----------|--------------------|
| <b>Team Progression</b>     |               |               |          |             |          |                    |
| Semi Finals                 | 20.9          | 48.9          | 23.7     | 5.8         | 0.7      |                    |
| Quarter Finals              | 17.9          | 47.2          | 25.5     | 7.5         | 1.9      |                    |
| First Round                 | 17.4          | 33.7          | 31.3     | 13.5        | 1.1      | (0.052)            |
| <b>FIFA Ranking of Team</b> |               |               |          |             |          |                    |
| 1-4 <sup>th</sup> Rank      | 20.6          | 54.4          | 22.8     | 1.5         | 0.7      |                    |
| 5-8 <sup>th</sup> Rank      | 20.8          | 40.9          | 26.6     | 10.4        | 1.3      |                    |
| 9-12 <sup>th</sup> Rank     | 13.1          | 34.4          | 31.1     | 19.7        | 1.6      |                    |
| 13-16 <sup>th</sup> Rank    | 15.3          | 27.8          | 41.7     | 13.9        | 1.4      | (0.000*)           |
| <b>Number of CAN Titles</b> |               |               |          |             |          |                    |
| Never                       | 18.7          | 43.3          | 30.0     | 6.0         | 2.0      |                    |
| Once                        | 13.6          | 26.3          | 35.6     | 23.7        | 0.8      |                    |
| Twice                       | 20.4          | 46.3          | 29.6     | 3.7         | 0.0      |                    |
| Fourth                      | 27.8          | 51.9          | 17.7     | 1.3         | 1.3      |                    |
| Fifth                       | 9.1           | 72.7          | 18.2     | 0.0         | 0.0      | (0.000*)           |
| <b>Goal difference</b>      |               |               |          |             |          |                    |
| 6 to 10                     | 20.9          | 48.9          | 23.7     | 5.8         | 0.7      |                    |
| 1 to 5                      | 10.4          | 33.3          | 25.0     | 27.1        | 4.2      |                    |
| 0 to -1                     | 19.3          | 38.6          | 32.9     | 9.3         | 0.0      |                    |
| -5 to -9                    | 18.8          | 41.7          | 31.3     | 6.3         | 2.1      | (0.001*)           |

\*Significant at  $p < 0.05$

Respondents' satisfaction with the event appeared to have been influenced by the performance of their national teams. The chi-square test indicated a significant relationship between respondents' satisfaction and team performance benchmarks like FIFA ranking ( $p = 0.000$ ), number of CAN titles won ( $p = 0.000$ ) and goal difference ( $p = 0.001$ ). From Table 7, respondents whose national teams progressed to the semi-finals appeared to be more satisfied, with 20.9 percent and 48.9 percent of them rating the event as excellent and very good respectively. Furthermore, 17.9 percent and 47.2 percent of those whose national team reached the quarter finals rated the event as excellent and very good respectively whilst 17.4 percent and 33.7 percent of those whose national teams could not go beyond the first round rated it as such. Using the FIFA ranking of January 2008 as a benchmark, respondents whose teams were ranked higher (1<sup>st</sup> - 4<sup>th</sup> rank in Africa) seemed more satisfied than those with lower rankings. More than half of the respondents (54.4%) from the 1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> ranked teams rated the event as very good whilst only 0.7 percent of them rated it as poor. However, 27.8 percent and 1.4 percent of respondents from the 13<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> ranked teams rated the event as very good and poor respectively. Clearly, respondents whose teams performed better in the tournament and in the FIFA rankings such as Ghanaians, Camerounians, Nigerians and Egyptians appeared more satisfied than those whose national teams performed badly such as South Africans, Tunisians and Angolans.

## Discussion

Customers' satisfaction is important to the successful marketing of products and services and so is the satisfaction of sports tourists important to the successful marketing and hosting of events, since satisfied customers are more likely to attend subsequent events (Shonk, 2006) and convince others to attend. The success of an event is also determined by the number of people who attend the event especially in the case of sporting events. No matter how interesting a match, the absence of fans will render it

uninteresting because even the players take inspiration from them. The issue of attracting sports tourists to mega events like CAN and meeting their needs is therefore imperative. The fact that respondents were generally satisfied with the event (overall satisfaction = 3.68) is therefore important so far as attendance to subsequent CAN events like Angola 2010 is concerned. This is because judgements made on satisfaction serve as important predictors of future patronage (Madrigal 1995). This will in turn impact on profitability since satisfaction is closely related to customer loyalty and profitability (Fornell 1992; Greenwell *et al.*, 2002; Musa *et al.*, 2004). This is underscored by the fact that 73.6 percent of the respondents indicated that they will be willing to attend the subsequent CAN event.

The study shows that with the exception of the religion ( $p = 0.003$ ), geographic region ( $p = 0.026$ ), national language ( $p = 0.007$ ) and size of travel group ( $p = 0.028$ ), most of the socio-demographic characteristics and travel characteristics of tourists did not significantly relate to respondents' satisfaction with the event. Thus sports tourists' satisfaction with the CAN 2008 event was not influenced by their age, sex, marital status, level of education as well as other travel characteristics like travel arrangement, food arrangement and accommodation arrangement. However, religion, language and geographic regions which distinguish the sports tourists from different parts of Africa, clearly affects their satisfaction with the event. There are differences in perceptions among the Northern Africans who speak Arabic, Anglophone and Francophone West Africans and Anglophone South Africans. Size of travel group also significantly related to satisfaction with the event.

Also, the study shows the effect of national team performance on the satisfaction of sports tourists. National team's progression in the tournament ( $p = 0.052$ ), FIFA ranking of team ( $p = 0.000$ ), number of CAN titles won ( $p = 0.000$ ) and goal differences in tournament ( $p = 0.001$ ) were found to significantly influence sports tourists' satisfaction with the event. Respondents whose teams performed better were found to be more satisfied than their counterparts whose teams did not fare well. This

supports the concepts of team identification and win/lose phenomenon proposed by Madrigal (1995) and Mullin (1985) respectively as factors determining sports satisfaction.

Generally, respondents were more satisfied with the sociological aspects of the tournament such as hospitality ( $M = 2.13$ ), the matches ( $M = 2.14$ ), and social interactions ( $M = 2.36$ ) than the operational aspects of the event such as cost/price ( $M = 3.05$ ), information/signage ( $M = 3.10$ ) and ticketing ( $M = 2.88$ ). It is not surprising that hospitality received the highest ratings as Ghanaians are widely recognized as hospitable (*proverbial Ghanaian Hospitality*). The tournament also promoted social interactions by bringing people from different parts of Africa and the rest of the world together to socialize. This was effectively captured by the theme of the event, 'sharing passions at the centre of the world.' Respondents were generally satisfied with the high quality of the matches which they attributed to the quality of the stadia and pitches coupled with good officiating and the fact that most of the players were playing regularly in top-flight leagues in Europe.

Aspects of the event which respondents were less satisfied with were those related to organizational deficiencies. These were cost of participation and prices of goods and services in general ( $M = 3.05$ ), ticketing ( $M = 2.88$ ) and dissemination of information on the event ( $M = 3.10$ ). For instance 16.8 percent of respondents rated ticketing as poor, compared with 11.2 percent who rated it as excellent. The manner in which tickets for the matches were issued and the accreditation process for journalists received a lot of criticisms which were captured by the media. There were news reports of people forming long queues for tickets and confusion with the accreditation process (The Statesman, 9<sup>th</sup> January 2008; Daily Graphic, 19<sup>th</sup> January 2008; Ghanaian Chronicle, 14<sup>th</sup> February 2008). There were also instances where tickets for some matches ran out but on the day of those matches, the stadia were not filled and some people were seen selling tickets at the gate at exorbitant prices. There were middlemen who were seen selling tickets at exorbitant prices at the match venues.

These problems underscore the importance of prudent ticketing, accreditation and pricing arrangements to the successful staging of mega sporting events. Issues relating to ticketing, pricing and information dissemination are purely administrative and could be addressed by the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) with the right management intervention.

### Conclusions and Implications

This study sought to examine the satisfaction of sports tourists from different parts of Africa with the CAN 2008 event as well as what influences their satisfaction. The results of the study suggests that sports tourists were generally satisfied with the CAN 2008 event but appeared to be more satisfied with the sociological aspects of the event like hospitality and social interaction than with ticketing and information dissemination arrangements. The study has marketing, management and research implications.

First of all, the results of the study clearly point out the fact that mega sporting events like CAN 2008 are attended by well-educated and full-time employed young males and this has implications for marketing. Marketing efforts for subsequent events should be directed at people with these socio-demographics since they are more likely to attend. Single male professionals, who are usually in groups of 10 and above and make their own travel arrangements and youth groups, should particularly be targeted. There is the need for organizers to pay equal attention to marketing rather than just investing huge amounts of money into the construction of stadia and other facilities based on the belief that *if you build it they would come*. This is against the backdrop that during the event some of the matches were played in virtually empty stadia.

Moreover, the study has implications for the organization of future events, especially with the issuance of tickets, dissemination of information and the pricing of other goods and services related to the event. There should be opportunities for people to buy tickets in advance

of the matches from designated outlets in their home countries before embarking on the trip to the host country. Also, e-tickets should be issued on-line so that people could purchase advance tickets irrespective of where they are located. This would work especially in a situation where people are informed that advance tickets are cheaper than those bought at the gate or a few days to the match. It would also lead to the elimination of ticket touts. Additionally, information on upcoming matches and events should be displayed at vantage points such as airports, bus terminals and major hotels. Furthermore, the organizers should provide information centres at all the match venues. The content of the information should not be limited to only the matches but other activities, attractions and facilities that would be of interest to tourists. Since there is the tendency for operators of transport, attraction sites, hotels and restaurants to capitalize on the event and hike their prices, organizers would have to build consensus with operators on the appropriate prices to charge for their services. In fact the LOC could reach an agreement with the various trade associations on appropriate price ceilings for their services.

Finally, the study has implications for further research into other factors that influence sports tourists' satisfaction. This is particularly imperative since studies on factors influencing satisfaction with sports events have been conducted on sports fans and spectators with very little on sports tourists. However, sports tourists are different because they have to travel usually over long distances and their motivations go beyond a mere desire to watch the matches or support their national teams but also a desire to explore the host destination and its tourism resources. The study indicates differences in satisfaction among Moslems and Christians as well as West Africans, North Africans and South Africans. It is therefore imperative to conduct further research on the psychographics of these different market segments and customize event packages to meet their needs.



## References

- Africanews* (2007). "3000 Malian Fans announced for Ghana 2008", 21<sup>st</sup> November, 2007, available at:  
[http://www.africanews.com/site/list\\_message/8640#m8640](http://www.africanews.com/site/list_message/8640#m8640)  
(accessed 18<sup>th</sup> May, 2008).
- Ajzen, I., and Fishbein, M. (eds.) (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Anderson, E.W. and Sullivan, M. (1993). The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms, *Marketing Science*, 12(2), 125-143.
- Attle, S. (1996). Tourist role preference and the development of life style profiles: implications for market segmentation and tourist destination selection." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Brunel, F. (1996). An economic analysis of the Barcelona '92 Olympic Games, in Miquel de Moragas and Miquel Botella (eds.), *The Keys to Success*, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Cadotte, E. R., Woodruff, R. B., and Jenkins, R. L. (1987). Expectations and norms in models of consumer satisfaction", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 305-314.
- Chon, K. (1989). Understanding recreational travellers' motivation, attitude and satisfaction, *The Tourist Review*, 44(1), 3-7.
- Commonwealth Department of Industry, Science and Resources (2000). Towards a National Sports Tourism Strategy (Draft), Canberra City, available at <http://www.tourism.gov.au>, (accessed 30/01/07).
- Crompton, J.L. and McKay, S.L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425-439.
- Daily Graphic* (2008). "Ghana 2008 to rake in a billion dollars", 17<sup>th</sup> January.
- Daily Graphic* (2008). "Hell at media accreditation", 19<sup>th</sup> January.
- Dobson, N., Gratton, C and Holliday, S. (1997). Football came home: the economic impact of Euro '96, Leisure Industries Research Centre.

- Fisk, R. P. and Young, C. E. (1985). Disconfirmation of equity expectations: effects on consumer satisfaction with services, In Hirschman, E., and Holbrook, H. (eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Fornell, C. (1992). A national customer satisfaction barometer: the Swedish experience, *Journal of Marketing*, 56, 6-21.
- Foster, D. (1997). Measuring customer satisfaction in the tourism industry, a paper presented at the 3rd International and 6th National Conference on Quality Management, Centre for Management Quality Research, RMIT, Melbourne.
- Francken, D. A. and van Raaij, W. F. (1981). Satisfaction with leisure time activities, *Journal of Leisure Research*, 13(4), 337-352.
- Gammon, S. and Robinson, T. (1997). Sport and tourism: a conceptual framework, *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 4(3), 1-6.
- Ghanaian Chronicle (2008). Ghana 2008- Autopsy Report, 14<sup>th</sup> February.
- Gibson, H. (1994). Some predictors of tourist role preference for men and women over the adult life course, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Glyptis, S. A. (1991). Sport and tourism, In Cooper, C.P., (ed.), *Progress in Tourism, Recreation, and Hospitality Management*, 3, 165-183. London: Belhaven.
- Graham, S., Neirotti, L. and Goldblatt, J. (eds) (2001). *The Ultimate Guide to Sports Marketing*, 2nd. Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gratton, C., Dobson, N. and Shibli, S. (2000). The economic importance of major sports events: a case study of six events, *Managing Leisure*, 5, 17-28.
- Greenwell, T. C., Fink, J. and Pastore, D. (2002). Assessing the influence of the physical sports facility on customer satisfaction within the context of the service experience. *Sport Management Review*, 5, 129-148.

- Hallowell, R. (1996). The relationships of customer satisfaction, customer loyalty and profitability: an empirical study", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 7(4), 27-42.
- Herrmann, A., Huber, F. and Braunstein, C. (2000). Market-driven product and service design: bridging the gap between customer needs, quality management, and customer satisfaction, *International Journal of Production Economics*. 66(1), 77-96.
- Hudson, S. (ed), (2003). *Sport and Adventure Tourism*, New York: Haworth Press.
- Johnson, M.D., Anderson, E.W. and Fornell, C. (1995). Rational and adaptive performance expectations in a customer satisfaction framework, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 695-707.
- Kotler, P. (1994). *Marketing management: Analysis, planning, implementation, and control*, 8th edition, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Kozak, M., and Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an off-season holiday destination, *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 260-269.
- Leeuwen, L.V., Quick, S. and Daniel, K. (2002). The sport spectator satisfaction model: a conceptual framework for understanding the satisfaction of spectators, *Sport Management Review*, 5, 99-128.
- Likert, R. (1970). A technique for the measurement of attitudes, In Summers, G.F. (ed.) *Attitude Measurement*, 149-158, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Lovelock, C. H. (1991). *Services Marketing : Text, Cases and Readings*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Lovelock, C. H., Patterson, P. G., and Walker, R. H. (2001). *Services Marketing: An Asia-Pacific Perspective*, 2nd Edition, Australia: Prentice Hall.
- MacKay, K. J. and Crompton, J. L. (1990). Measuring the quality of recreation services, *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 8(3), 47-56.

- Madrigal, R. (1995). Cognitive and affective determinants of fan satisfaction with sporting event attendance, *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27, 205-227.
- Madrigal, R. and Howard, D. R. (1995). The development of the FANDIM scale and its potential applications to understanding sport spectators, Conference Paper presented at the *North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) Conference*.
- McMahon-Beattie, U. and Yeoman, I. (eds.) (2004). *Sport and Leisure Operations Management*, London: Thomson Learning.
- Mullin, B. (1985). Characteristics of sport marketing, In Lewis, G. and Appenzeller, H. (eds.), *Successful Sport Management*, 101-123, Charlottesville: The Michie Company.
- Musa, R., Pallister, J. and Robson, M., (2004). Assessing customer satisfaction within the direct sales channel using consumption system approach: Empirical evidence from Malaysia, *Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy*, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Neirotti, L.D., Bosetti, H.A. and Teed, K.C. (2001). Motivation to attend the 1996 summer. Olympic games, *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(3), 327-331.
- Nogawa, H., Yamaguchi, Y. and Hagi, Y. (1996). An empirical study on Japanese sport tourism in sport-for-all events : Case studies of a single-night event and a multiple night event, *Journal of Travel Research*, 34, 46-54.
- Oliver, R. L., and Swan, J. E. (1989). Consumer perceptions of interpersonal equity and satisfaction in transactions: A field survey approach, *Journal of Marketing*, 53, 21-35.
- Oliver, R.L. (1997). *Satisfaction: a Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pizam, A., Neuman, Y. and Reichel, A. (1979). Tourist satisfaction: uses and misuses, *Annals. of Tourism Research*, 6, 96-107.

- Pizam, A. and Ellis, T. (1999). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality enterprises, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(7), 326-339.
- Ritchie, J.R.B. and Smith, B, H. (1991). The impact of a Mega-Event on host region awareness: a longitudinal study, *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(1), 3-10.
- Shonk, D.J. (2006). Perceptions of service quality, satisfaction and the intent to return among tourists attending a sporting event, unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Standeven, J. and Deknop, P. (1999). *Sport Tourism*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- The Statesman* (2008). Countdown to CAN 2008, 3<sup>rd</sup> May.
- The Statesman* (2008). Ghana 2008 opening ceremony tickets run out, 9<sup>th</sup> January.
- Tse, D. K. and Wilton, P. C. (1988). Models of consumer satisfaction: an extension, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25, 204-212.
- Wakefield, K.L. and Blodgett, J.G. (1994). The importance of servicescapes in leisure service settings, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 8, 66-76.
- Woodall, T. (2003). Conceptualising 'Value for the Customer': an attributional, structural and dispositional analysis, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 12, available at, <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/woodall12-2003.pdf>, (accessed, 18<sup>th</sup> May, 2008).
- Yoon, Y. and Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model", *Tourism Management*, 26, 45-56.