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Introduction

Hosts of sport events (other than small and strictly local events) are in the tourism business whether they know it or not. In fact, access to local sport facilities, provision of public services, and direct public subsidies to events are nearly always legitimised on the grounds that events render positive economic benefits by attracting tourists (i.e., non-locals) whose spending enhances the local economy (Mondello and Rishe 2004; Taks et al. 2013). Consequently, the task for destination marketers has been to create a portfolio of events that includes sport events, as well as arts and cultural events (Ziakas 2014). The portfolio of events is expected to serve two complementary objectives: (1) to attract visitors at the time of each event in order to fill hotel and motel space that would otherwise be empty, as well as to foster visitor spending at the destination; and (2) to incorporate events into the destination marketing mix in a manner that enhances the destination’s attractiveness to tourists who will consequently visit even when an event is not taking place, particularly by using the event purposefully in overall destination branding.

One of the most significant challenges for any destination is to attract repeat visitation (Fyall et al. 2003; Morais and Lin 2010). Events play a key role in destination marketing not merely because they serve as attractions, but also because they enable the destination to reinvent itself each year and each season. Museums, cultural heritage sites, theme parks, and other attractions are fundamentally stagnant. They change very little over time. As a result, tourist demand for a destination can wane over time as tourists seek new attractions and new experiences (Butler 1980; Weaver et al. 2009). Events, on the other hand, can be redesigned and reinvented each year, and new events can readily replace old ones. Thus, events can be a practical means to freshen what the destination offers in order to attract visitors back in subsequent years or seasons (Kaplanidou and Vogt 2007; Snelgrove and Wood 2010).

It is useful for event organisers and destination marketers to understand the essential relationship between events and destination marketing. The support that event organisers obtain depends on that relationship because the event’s ultimate value depends on its ability to generate tourism. Destination marketers, on the other hand, must be able to incorporate each event into the destination’s aggregate product and service mix in order to optimise the contribution of events to their tourism marketing. Although the value to both tourism marketers and event organisers is clearly evident (Jago et al. 2003), the two have not typically appreciated their degree...
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of interdependence, so they have not worked well together (Weed 2003). Both have consequently foregone otherwise attainable revenues (Chalip and Leyns 2002; Taks et al. 2013). In fact, in the absence of strategic synergies between event and tourism marketing, the true economic value of an event can be negative, even when official economic impact estimates are positive (Taks et al. 2011). When costs and crowding out effects are considered, an event may be of negligible value to its local economy unless compensating efforts are undertaken to amplify the event’s effect, especially for tourism.

The remainder of this chapter considers each of the two objectives of event tourism. Tourism to events is considered first, and the necessary means to leverage benefits from an event for the destination are described. Relations between events and destination branding are then examined, and the means to optimise the contribution of each to the other are reviewed. The necessity of thinking beyond individual sport events by considering the entire portfolio of events at the host destination is then noted. Finally, the notion that tourism benefits are a ‘legacy’ of events is analysed critically, and some necessary directions for future research are noted.

Tourism to sport events

In order for an event to render a positive tourism benefit, it needs to attract tourists at times when hospitality providers are operating below capacity. For example, Canada’s resort municipality of Whistler, in British Columbia, is a premier international skiing destination. It boasts sufficient accommodations for the high demand winter skiing period. However, since skiing is not a summer activity, it needs to find ways to fill room-nights that would otherwise be vacant. For that purpose, Whistler has developed Mountain Bike Park, which it then uses as a base for a substantial portfolio of mountain biking events that can take place during the summer, thereby attracting tourists when demand for accommodation would otherwise be low. Between the beginning of June 2014 and the end of July 2014, Whistler offered a portfolio of 18 mountain biking events, along with events in other sports which benefit from a mountainous terrain, such as orienteering. The portfolio of events constitutes an effective means to attract tourists during times when visitation to the destination might otherwise remain substantially below capacity.

However, the mere fact of an event does not guarantee that there is a net gain in tourism. If tourism to a destination would otherwise be at capacity, the effect is simply to displace tourists, which renders no net gain to the economy. Consider Park City, Utah, in the United States, which is a premier destination for skiers, and which offers a substantial portfolio of arts and cultural events as attractions for tourists. One of its most famous events is the Sundance Film Festival, which takes place at the end of January – a period that is popular for skiers. Film festival attendees consequently displace skiers, with the result that the net gain for local tourism is negligible. The event itself may be valuable for other reasons (such as promoting the destination to market segments other than skiers), but the visitors to the Sundance Film Festival generally displace skiers who would otherwise visit. The result is that the event makes scant, if any, contribution to overall tourism.

Thus, from the standpoint of tourism, the visits that events add to tourism must be analysed from the perspective of unused capacity. Specifically, to what degree is each event in the portfolio filling tourism capacity that would otherwise be vacant, and to what degree is each event simply displacing visitors who would otherwise come to the destination? It is not the overall number of event goers that matters; it is the net gain in overall visitation that determines the value of each event as a tourism attraction. Failure to consider this matter is a common source of error when the economic value of an event is estimated (Crompton 1995).
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**Diversion and aversion effects**

In fact, events can discourage visitation, even in the presence of sufficient capacity to accommodate event visitors and leisure tourists with no interest in the event. When an event is large enough that tourists are concerned that the event could alter the quality of their experience at the destination, they may choose to go elsewhere at the time of the event. This is an aversion effect. One of the core challenges for destination marketers is to assure that an event does not reduce the likelihood that tourists will come to a destination. For example, Australian destination marketers were concerned that the Sydney Olympic Games would lead international tourists (especially from Europe and North America) to conclude that Australia would be unwelcoming to tourists during the year that the Sydney Olympic Games took place. To prevent that aversion effect, Australian destination marketers formulated a campaign dubbed ‘Australia Fun and Games’, which was then pushed through media, travel agents, and tourism wholesalers in key source markets. The purpose was to prevent aversion effects, and to capitalise on the Olympic Games to attract tourists to Australia around the time of the Sydney Olympic Games, even if they were not attending the event.

Events can also divert tourists from one location to another, even within the destination. This is a diversion effect. Consequently, even if an event has a positive aggregate impact, some stakeholders will be worse off, even if others benefit. For example, during the Special Olympics World Games in New Haven, Connecticut, locals and visitors were attracted to the precincts hosting and surrounding the event, with the result that businesses close to the event did quite well. Businesses more distally located did poorly during the event, and were worse off because of it (Putsis 1998). Thus, the diversion of visitors to event precincts rendered a transfer of income from businesses located at some distance from the event to businesses that were close to the event.

These effects can be amplified by accompanying markets, which can encourage or discourage particular tourism activities during an event. It is common for event tourists to travel with others. The experiences they obtain when traveling with others to attend a sport event are important (Fairley 2003). Who that might be is important. If people who travel together (e.g., family, friends) share an interest in the event, then attendance should be facilitated; if they do not, then attendance could be constrained. So, marketing sport events requires that the event be made appealing to multiple market segments, especially family and friends, and so doing requires means to add value to accompanying markets, particularly those who might not otherwise find the event appealing (Chalip and Leyns 2002; García 2001). This matters for event marketers and tourism marketers as both want persons with an interest in the event to visit, even when those who might accompany them do not share an interest in the event.

The consequent challenge for destination marketers is to determine which market segments may be averted because of an event, and to determine how an event might divert tourists. The wants and needs of travel decision makers are pivotal, but the roles and effects of those who are likely to accompany potential event goers also need to be considered. The resulting challenge is to formulate means to redress diversion of event goers and accompanying markets, as well as aversion of tourists who might find the destination more appealing if the event were not taking place. Destination marketers can promote activities and develop marketing campaigns to counteract diversion, and to appeal to accompanying markets; event organisers can plan ancillary entertainments and marketing communications that facilitate this task (Chalip and Leyns 2002; García 2001; Jago et al. 2003).
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Attracting and capitalising on visitors to events

Some tourists at events have come to the destination for the event itself, and other activities are secondary. These are considered primary event visitors. Some tourists have come to the destination for other reasons, but may take advantage of the event by attending it. These are considered secondary event visitors. The difference is important because marketing to the two groups may require different approaches.

Primary event visitors

Tourists whose primary objective is to attend a sport event are distinctive in important ways. In the first place, they are engaged in the subculture that is associated with their sport (Green 2001). Involvement in any particular sport is typically characterised by distinctive values and beliefs into which participants and fans are socialised (Holt 1995; Green and Chalip 1998; Wheaton 2007). This affects their activity preferences, their use of media, and the ways that they interact socially while enjoying an event. The more fully socialised they are into the subculture, the more it becomes an integral part of their identity (Jones and Green 2006). Thus, attending a sport event can be much more than mere escape or entertainment; it becomes an expression of who the attendee is (Green 2001).

This is not to say that escape or entertainment are unimportant. In fact, the classic big four leisure motives (Beard and Ragheb 1983) of escape, challenge, socialising with others who share the same interest, and learning about the sport and/or the destination can jointly and separately provide the necessary push and pull to attend an event (Kim and Chalip 2004; Kim and Chalip 2010). However, the ways these express themselves depend to a substantial degree on the nature of the subculture. Marketing communications intended to appeal to any one or any combination of these four motives must be framed in ways that are appropriate for the subculture, and must be segmented to appeal to variations within that subculture (Green 2001; Kim and Chalip 2010). A core task of market research for sport events is to formulate an ethnography of the sport’s subculture (Sands 2002), describe the ways that motives express themselves among members of the subculture, and segment potential attendees with reference to their values, beliefs, motives, and consequent preferences. These provide the necessary grist for effective marketing.

Subculture is important beyond marketing communications. It matters in event design. An event is most appealing, especially for repeat attendance, if its design fosters engagements that are congruent with attendees’ engagement with the sport’s subculture (Green 2001; Jones and Green 2006). It is helpful if the physical layout and social opportunities enable attendees to parade and celebrate their identification with the subculture (Green and Chalip 1998). Celebrations and social organisation that are consistent with the sport’s subculture can enhance security more effectively than the typically repressive tactics that are the standard resort of first choice for events (Veno and Veno 1992). Consequently, social spaces, celebrations, and formal as well as informal opportunities for social interaction among attendees need to be incorporated into the event in ways that are congruent with the subculture associated with its sport. Again, market research, especially ethnographic research (You and Kaltenbach 2007), can be enormously useful for event design. If the objective is to appeal to those who are most likely to attend (rather than merely to design an event that other event designers might admire), then it is vital to understand the sport’s subculture, including the ways that it segments.

One way to make effective use of market research data is to break down the ways that events become meaningful to those who attend (as well as to those who follow events via media). People
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project meanings into events, which is the key reason that events become attractive and even important to attendees (Handelman 1998). Meanings derived from sport events are fashioned from three primary sources: (1) event narratives, (2) the multiple genres at events, and (3) event symbols (Chalip 1992).

Stories abound before, during, and after events. These become meaningful to their audience to the degree that their themes address issues and concerns that are salient and important to those who might attend (or follow via media). Ethnographic market research should identify themes that are most likely to appeal to the target market, including its segments. Creating multiple narratives that incorporate those themes will enhance the event’s attractiveness. This is a key to construction of an effectively targeted media relations strategy (Eder 2011). It is not sufficient merely to generate favourable press for an event; it is important wherever possible for story themes to appeal to members of the sport’s subculture.

Good sport events incorporate more than sport. They include festival, ceremonies, spectacle, and adjunct events, each of which is a supporting genre. For example, most multi-sport events and some world championships provide celebration sites at which people can gather away from the competition to celebrate during the event. Those sites often include live entertainment as well as big screen telecasts from the event. Many sport events incorporate concerts, art exhibitions, cultural activities, and sometimes other sport activities during the time of the event. Opening ceremonies, closing ceremonies, awards ceremonies, and other ceremonial activities are typical at events. Some ceremonies may be spectacular, as are the opening and closing ceremonies at mega-events like the Olympic Games. Others may have a sacred though secular aspect, as do many awards ceremonies. When well-designed, ceremonies, including spectacles, provide a sense of solemnity and transcendence. They communicate that something important – something beyond mere sport – is taking place. Festival, ceremonies, and adjunct events can intensify the experience that event goers obtain immediately before, during, and immediately after an event. While ceremonies communicate a sense of the event’s significance (Handelman 1998; MacAloon 1982), festival and adjunct events provide opportunities for social interaction and consequent celebrations of subculture beyond event competitions (Fairley 2003; O’Brien 2007). This enhances the quality of social effect that events have (Chalip 2006; Veno and Veno 1992), and it expands an event’s overall appeal (Green and Chalip 1998; García 2001). The same market research initiated to enable effective marketing communications for the event can be used to build festivals in a manner appropriate to the sports’ subculture, and to incorporate adjunct events that are meaningful to target market segments. Appropriately designed and implemented, these can make the event more attractive to more people, thereby attracting more tourists who attend the event.

Sport events also include symbols. These could include flags, emblems, logos, animals, or tangible objects. Many events have their own flag but also display relevant national or regional flags; each event typically has its own logo but may also display emblems of other organisations with which it is affiliated; animal mascots or flights of birds are incorporated into some events; medals and trophies are common; events may also include a flame (e.g., the Olympic Games), a baton (e.g., the Commonwealth Games), or some other tangible representation of its intended significance. When a symbol already has meaning (e.g., a national flag), its meaning is incorporated into the event through its display. When a symbol is taken from classic cultural heritage (e.g., the Olympic Flame), it imports a sense of cultural roots. When a symbol is designed for and associated with an event, its meaning derives from its repeated association with particular narratives and genres. Thus, symbols become effective when they are chosen or designed to appeal to target markets, and are then layered throughout competition venues as well as spaces intended for socialising among attendees. These can enhance the quality of affect attendees obtain at events,
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thereby intensifying the event’s appeal (Chalip 1992). Once again, market research as described above should play a role in the choice and design of symbols.

From the standpoint of tourism, simply attracting visitors to an event is only part of the challenge. If event visitors spend very little at an event, or if their spending goes to vendors who leave the host destination shortly after the event is over, then the value of the tourism generated is slight. Thus, it is important to stimulate local spending by event attendees. Four strategies and associated tactics toward that end have been identified in previous work (Chalip 2004), and have been shown to be useful (Chalip and Leyns 2002; O’Brien 2007; Taks et al. 2009): (1) entice visitor spending, (2) lengthen visitor stays, (3) retain event expenditures, and (4) enhance business relationships. Each of the four strategies incorporates multiple tactics.

Event visitors purchase more than tickets, food, and souvenirs. They may visit local attractions, shop in local stores, and socialise at local eating and drinking establishments. Tourist spending during each of these activities enhances the overall value of the event to the local economy (Mondello and Riche 2004), so effective marketing to event tourists requires each of these activities to be encouraged and nurtured. It has been shown that successful stimulation of event visitor spending requires special promotions to event visitors (Chalip and Leyns 2002). This includes advertising by local businesses that is targeted at event visitors, as well as tie-in promotions (e.g., contests, coupons, sales) to attract event visitors to local businesses. If the wants and needs that attendees bring differ from those of locals or the typical leisure tourist, then it may be necessary to adjust the stock of merchandise available during the time of the event. Theming local businesses through decorations and/or entertainments designed to tie-in to the event has also been found to increase the appeal of local businesses to event patrons. Promotions and theming are particularly effective when local businesses formulate tactics jointly in order to generate an event-related look-and-feel to their precinct. These findings demonstrate that a coordinated strategy to foster spending by event visitors is particularly useful. Since this is a task for local business (perhaps through local business associations or in cooperation with the economic development agency of local government), event organisers are in a poor position to engender and enable the requisite promotions and theming, although event organisers can certainly assist through provision of market intelligence as well as relevant items for theming or promotional giveaways. Effective local business leveraging of an event is coordinated most effectively through local business associations, in cooperation with government economic development agencies, or through task forces formed expressly for that purpose.

Lengthening the stay of event visitors can increase their local spending because it lengthens the time during which they will be paying for accommodation, food, and tourism activities. Three tactics are useful: (1) the time over which the event takes place can be lengthened so that visitors feel compelled to stay longer in order to appreciate the event fully; (2) pre-event and post-event opportunities can be provided during which aficionados can spend time together; and (3) pre-event and post-event tours and/or activities can be bundled into the event and marketed as options when people purchase event tickets or packages. The first of these tactics has become a well-established aspect of many sport events, as tie-in competitions and shows are increasingly being added. For example, auto racing events often include car shows and less significant races in the days leading-up to the feature event. Pre-event and post-event opportunities for event attendees to spend time together are also becoming more common. For example, The Preakness Celebration has been created in Baltimore to turn a short championship horse race (the Preakness) into a week-long event during which visitors can participate in cultural events and sport competitions together, and even attend parades, concerts, and special performances together. Bundling tours and activities with events remains less common, although research (Chalip and McGuirty 2004; Kim and Chalip 2010) suggests its utility.
Bundling takes place when event organisers offer tourism opportunities (e.g., shopping, tours, and activities) to event goers when they purchase their tickets, travel, and/or accommodation for the event. In marketing, bundling is thought to add value because it enables the purchaser to obtain a package of desired elements, which can save time, energy, and cost over purchasing each element separately (Fuellerer, Herrmann and Wuebker 1999). For tourism, there is the further value that the commitment is made prior to travel, so that the event goer is prepared to participate in the bundled elements from the outset (cf. Pearce 2008; Taks et al. 2009). Bundling is potentially useful to event organisers, as it enables them to sell the host destination as well as the event, which should make the event more attractive and enhance the value of travel to attend the event. Bundling is useful for tourism marketers because it encourages tourism before, during, and/or after the event.

The risk, however, is that tourism marketers may treat event goers like any other leisure tourist, and offer tourism opportunities that may not be attractive to the distinctive psychographics of event attendees. For example, tourism marketers for the Gold Coast Marathon sought to promote the theme parks for which Australia’s Gold Coast is famous, and which are key attractions for that destination. However, market research demonstrated that the theme parks were unattractive to marathoners, even when they attended the event with their children. They preferred active tourism, such as packages enabling them to engage in local watersports or visit the nearby rainforest (Chalip and McGuirty 2004) – tourism activities that are consistent with the active living subculture of marathoners, but that are less typical of mainstream leisure tourists to the Gold Coast. Similarly, Americans considering attending sport events in Korea were not particularly interested in historical tours (e.g., Korean War history) that are popular with leisure tourists (Kim and Chalip 2010), but do find added value in the prospect of learning more about Korean culture (Kim and Chalip 2004). It seems that sport event tourists will find value in bundling, but the package of interest to them may differ in significant ways from packages offered to mainstream leisure tourists. We know very little about the distinctive wants and needs of sport event tourists. Conjoint analysis (Rao 2014) has been found to be particularly useful for profiling the preferences that event tourists have so that appropriate bundling options can be provided to them (cf. Chalip and McGuirty 2004; Kim and Chalip 2010).

Nevertheless, stimulating spending by event tourists does not contribute to the host destination’s economy if that spending leaves the destination. Event organisers are increasingly encouraged to produce events that can be admired for their professionalism. As a result, there are an increasing number of providers who specialise in offering goods and services to events, many of which may be in distal regions or other countries. This trend may enable greater professionalism in event production, but it is damaging to the host destination economy because wages paid to outside providers and the profits from their sales and services leave the host destination economy. When their work is done, the provider takes their earnings back to their company’s home community. Tourist spending contributes to the host destination economy only when the spending is retained in the local economy. For that reason, using local suppliers and vendors is essential if stimulating tourism spending is going to be of value to the host destination.

Event tourists have lives beyond their sport enthusiasms. Some enjoy positions of influence in businesses based in the communities from which they come. Sponsors, in particular, bring tourists whose business is important to them to sport events (Brown 2002). Providing opportunities for local business people to meet event tourists who might become customers or business partners can enhance local business networks, thus enhancing the value obtained from some sport event tourists (O’Brien 2006). Sport events are a poor time to close business deals, but they can be a useful occasion for creating or enhancing business relationships. This can be done by capitalising
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on sponsor hospitality as a venue for meeting visiting attendees, creating tradeshows and systems that can support event visitors’ business activities, and inviting existing business partners to attend the event as guests of one or more local businesses.

Secondary event visitors

When visiting a destination, tourists engage in an array of activities to enhance the overall quality of experience that they obtain (Pearce 2005). A sport event taking place during their visit may contribute to the quality of their experience at the destination. This is useful for tourism marketers because it can elevate visitor satisfaction. It is useful for event marketers because it opens an additional market for their event.

From the standpoint of event management and marketing, there are three fundamental challenges: (1) to identify visitors who are coming to the destination for reasons other than the event, (2) to make them aware of the event, and (3) to make the event attractive so that they will want to attend. So far, the marketing techniques applied to reach secondary event visitors have been haphazard, and have derived from mainstream marketing techniques. There has been no systematic research into secondary event visitors. Typically, the first two challenges are addressed by advertising to tourists through local tourist media, including media distributed through local hotels and restaurants. Special promotions are also sometimes used. For example, the Toledo Mud Hens (a minor league baseball team in the United States) partnered with Delta Air Lines to run a promotional contest on flights into Toledo. The chance to win a ticket to a Mud Hens game was intended to add salience to the team’s games, and to make attendance seem attractive. The efficacy of advertising and promotions intended to entice secondary event visitors is not known.

Since secondary event tourists come from the pool of local leisure and business tourists, it is unlikely that they share the intensity of involvement with the sport’s subculture that is expected for primary event visitors. This creates a particular challenge for event marketers, who are often assigned responsibility for reaching this market. How can they convince tourists who did not come to the destination to attend a sport event that so doing would enhance their overall tourism experience? The standard practice has been to develop media and advertising along lines similar to those used to attract locals. After all, much of the media produced will also reach locals, and there are no data suggesting that temporary visitors and permanent residents differ significantly in the reasons they might find a sport event to be attractive.

However, tourists and locals do differ (Snelgrove et al. 2008). The ultimate challenge is to determine how a sport event can contribute to the overall experience that tourists seek. Just as tourists choose different destinations for different reasons (Pontos 2011; Seyedmehdi 2012), it is likely that there is no unique formula for enticing secondary event attendees. Yet destination marketers who have done their homework often have substantial information on the wants and needs of local tourists. That information can and should be mined by event marketers in order to formulate marketing messages that will be attractive to tourists who came to the destination for its own sake, rather than for a particular sport event. This illustrates again how essential it is for tourism marketers and event marketers to work together – a task which is made easier when the event brand and the destination brand are symbiotic.

Branding sport events and destinations jointly

Ultimately, the tourism value of events is not restricted to those who travel to attend the event. Events garner attention through popular media, social media, and conversation. Since events take place in a host destination, an event’s brand is affected by the host destination’s brand, and
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the attention an event garners can spill over to the host destination. To the degree that occurs, 
the destination’s brand equity and the event’s brand equity are affected (Chalip and Costa 2006). 
The reader is also directed to Chapter 16 in this Handbook, which examines concepts associ-
ated with sponsorship, branding, and marketing (e.g., ambush marketing) from the sponsors’ 
perspective.

To date, the majority of work in tourism has treated destination image and destination brand 
as if they were synonymous. This makes intuitive sense insomuch as models of product branding 
typically reference ‘brand image’ (Franzen and Moriarty 2009), and it is reasonable to expect that 
tourists have some sort of mental image of a tourism destination (Gallarza et al. 2002; Pan and 
Li 2011). However, destination image and destination brand are by no means synonymous. The 
work on destination image has been overwhelmingly inductive as tourists’ ratings or descriptions 
of a destination have been analysed post hoc and with minimal effort to build a general theory. 
Much of the work on destination image over the past decade has utilised a heuristic framework 
that requires both cognitive and affective elements of image to be included (Goosens 2000; San 
Martin and Rodríguez del Bosque 2008). However, a general and useful theory of destination 
image has not been forthcoming as the diverse array of methods applied and destination charac-
teristics studied have rendered a cacophony of incommensurate results.

In contrast, research on branding has been theorised with reference to psychological models 
of consumer cognition and affect (Franzen and Moriarty 2009). It has been argued that this is 
a distinct advantage of studying destination brand over studying destination image (Morgan 
et al. 2011). Brand research conceives the consumer as a rational actor who seeks to maximise 
the aggregate value obtained from any bundle of goods and services that is purchased. The value 
of a product or service to the consumer depends on the consumer’s evaluation of the benefits it 
provides and the degree to which the consumer values those benefits. The greater the net benefit, 
the more positive the consequent affect.

What makes the study of branding particularly advantageous for event managers and mar-
keters is that it provides the necessary conceptual framework for determining the ways that 
destinations and events jointly affect consumer evaluations. Theories of branding build from 
schema theory (Puligadda et al. 2012; Sujan and Bettman 1989), which holds that consumers 
develop expectations about product domains. Those are then organised hierarchically from gen-
eral expectations to expectations that apply to specific instances. The schema organises inform-
ation about attributes, the level of each attribute, the importance of each attribute, and the 
variability of each attribute.

Destinations and events are separate product domains. The tourist’s expectations about events 
and destinations will include suppositions about each. As experience with events or destinations 
accrues, cognitive elements of the schema for each and the affect associated with those elements 
will become more complex as information derived from each new experience is incorporated 
into relevant schemas. Schema theory provides a useful basis for describing tourists’ judgements 
and choices because it enables the expectations for a particular brand and the value associated 
with those expectations to be modelled. Further, it provides a dynamic portrayal of the ways 
that brand images grow and change. So, when applied to a destination, the phrase ‘brand image’ 
refers to the consumer’s perception of the destination’s attributes, consequent benefits, and the 
resulting value those confer (given the consumer’s preferences) at a point in time. It is not clear 
whether the dimensions inductively derived in destination image studies adequately represent a 
destination’s brand attributes. Destination attributes and destination image each seek to represent 
what is in the consumer’s mind. It is therefore possible that the two are related. Nevertheless, 
when applied to destinations, the destination brand offers the distinct advantage that it provides 
an elaborated specification of the hierarchical organisation of information, and the consequent
relationships among attributes, benefits, value, and choice. Those are not as well developed under the destination image paradigm.

There has been some recent work that endeavours to formulate event image studies along lines that parallel the work on destination image (Hallmann and Breuer 2010; Kaplanidou 2010). The same caveats put forward in favour of branding paradigms over image paradigms in the case of destinations also apply when it comes to events. Schema theory provides a more useful means to model the tourist’s image of an event, and then to apply that model when marketing the event.

Destination and event brands are not their name, logo, slogan, or any other marketing tool. Those are intended to represent each brand by invoking a brand image, which is a hierarchically related set of associations in memory — a schema. Each piece of information about the brand is connected to other pieces of information stored in memory, and the number and strength of those connections determines the schema’s structure. Since some pieces of information are present in more than one schema, schemas can become associated with one another, and one schema may even invoke another. The process by which each piece of information, its associated affect, and its associated pieces of information are brought into working memory is called ‘spreading activation’ (Horcajo et al. 2010; Janiszewski and Van Osselaer 2000). The equity of destination and event brands is intensified as the number of positive connections in memory grows and strengthens. The desirability of each element in the network of associations in memory depends on (1) the attributes favoured by target market segments, and (2) the degree to which those attributes favourably differentiate the destination or the event from others.

Herein lies the key to the ways that event brands and destination brands do and do not work together effectively. By associating the event with the destination, attributes from the event brand can become incorporated into the event brand. At the same time, by associating host destination attributes with the event brand, attributes from the destination brand can become incorporated into the destination brand. This is a process of co-branding (Tsiotsou 2014; Xing and Chalip 2006). It works well when each partner can capture associations from the other and build them into its brand. It can also be useful if at least one partner can obtain associations for its brand. It works poorly if neither brand helps the other.

The trick, then, is for event marketers to determine what the destination’s brand can contribute to the event brand, and for destination marketers to determine what the event’s brand can contribute to the destination brand (Chalip and Costa 2006). Market research can identify the associations that target market segments in source markets make with each brand. Then the target associations can be emphasised in event and destination advertising and publicity. In other words, the destination should incorporate desired aspects of the event into some of its marketing communications, and the event should incorporate desired aspects of the destination into its marketing communications. To reinforce the effect, the destination should be promoted through event signage, the destination’s name and/or icons need to be designed into the event logo, and visual representations of the destination need to be incorporated in event media (Green et al. 2003). This can be buttressed by contractual requirements for particular camera placements, choice of camera angles, use of video postcards, and inclusions in broadcaster commentary. As straightforward as all this sounds, it has rarely occurred, usually for the reasons noted at the outset of this chapter. Destination marketers and event organisers have not yet broken sufficiently free from their respective silos to form effective working alliances (Jago et al. 2003; Weed 2003).

Sponsors can also play an important role, particularly because the event’s association with its host destination can open avenues for ambush marketing (Hoek 2005). Visa’s experience as an Olympic sponsor provides an instructive example. During the 1990s, American Express was able to ambush Visa’s Olympic sponsorship by showing advertisements of people shopping in the Olympic host city or country while using an American Express card. Since the host destination
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was associated with the event in the consumer’s mind, associating the card with the host destination captured brand associations for which Visa had paid, but American Express had not. By the time of the Sydney Olympic Games in 2000, Visa had learned its lesson, and partnered with the Australian Tourist Commission (ATC, which is now called ‘Tourism Australia’) to undertake joint advertorials and promotions in key countries around the world so that Visa could capture associations with Sydney and Australia (Chalip 2000), which would then block American Express from ambushing Visa’s Olympic sponsorship. Other Olympic sponsors, such as Kodak and McDonald’s, also formed partnerships with the ATC for the same reasons.

This example is instructive. It demonstrates that there is added value for event organisers and for destination marketers when event partners, particularly event sponsors, are brought into the relationship. Bringing sponsors into the partnership between event organisers and destination marketers adds value to event sponsorships because it enhances the brand associations they can capture, and it closes off a significant avenue for ambush. In the case of the Sydney Olympic Games (and often since), event organisers resisted the partnership because they saw it as an intrusion into their relationship with the sponsor. By being overly protective of the sponsorship, they were actually undermining its potential value. Co-branding of events and destinations can be enhanced when business partners, especially sponsors, are incorporated into the endeavour.

Not all associations are positive, of course. Consider Australia’s Gold Coast, which markets itself in international markets as a premier destination for magnificent beaches, clean air, and dramatic rain forests. The Gold Coast also hosted an IndyCar event annually through which it sought to advance its brand through event telecasts throughout the world. However, studies of event telecast effects in key source markets found that the event lowered viewers’ ratings for the quality of the Gold Coast’s natural environment (Chalip, Green, and Hill 2003). The event’s technological and noisy image was incompatible with a destination brand emphasising a beneficent natural environment. This study illustrates that what is communicated and transferred in the process of co-branding an event and its host destination matters a great deal. It is not the amount of media that matters; it is what is communicated through media. To date, nearly all estimates of the value of event media have used comparable worth methods, which set the value of exposure through event media at (or above) what it would cost to purchase the same volume of media. That method is clearly fallacious insomuch as it assumes effects to be positive and at least as impactful as advertising wherein the message can be closely controlled. The true effects of event media on the destination, and vice versa, depend on what is communicated and how, not on the mere volume of exposure (Chalip 2005; Hede 2005).

There has been a great deal of speculation regarding the quality of match-up between sport products and the organisations with which they are co-branded (McDaniel 1999; Xing and Chalip 2006). If associations are important, then it makes sense to match events and destinations so that the associations in memory that each enjoys are compatible. Yet, from the standpoints of theory and practice, the match-up requirement is deficient on two grounds: (1) There is no heuristic or theoretically grounded basis for identifying appropriate matches. Match-ups are asserted on a priori grounds or are claimed post hoc because people accept or even like them. (2) The match-up requirement suggests that co-branding is useful for reinforcing existing brand associations, but not for changing them. If there must be a match from the outset, then changing one brand image by association with another would be unrealistic. Yet, destination marketers often seek to use sport events as a means to change, and not merely to reinforce, their brand (Berg et al. 2002), and marketing imagination applied to event communications can foster a change in the host destination’s brand image (Chalip 1990). The key is not whether the event and its destination enjoy any ex ante match; the key is to formulate marketing communications for the event and the
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destination in a manner that creates and anchors desired associations between each. What may matter most is the number and quality of brand associations the event and the destination each bring to the partnership (Xing and Chalip 2006), as the more complex the brand of each, the greater the number of choices for associations that can be focused upon throughout event and destination marketing communications.

Capitalising upon the complexity of associations that events and destinations bring to their partnership raises significant challenges, especially when there is asymmetry between the number and strength of associations enjoyed by each brand (Chalip and Costa 2006). When the two partners are somewhat comparable in the quantity and quality of brand associations they bring to the partnership, then co-branding can proceed as described so far. However, in the presence of substantial asymmetry, then some modification of the co-branding process is required.

Although sport events with strong brand images are readily brought to mind – such as the Olympic Games, the World Cup, Wimbledon, or a national championship event in a popular sport – the vast majority of sport events lack a distinctive brand image. In that instance, it is not uncommon for the event to rely closely on its host destination’s brand in order to build and maintain its brand. The New York City Marathon provides an instructive example. It began in 1970, when it had only 55 finishers and obtained scant media attention. Whereas the event was restricted to Central Park in its early years, by 1976, it sought to link itself more closely to the New York City brand by altering the race course so that it covered all five New York City boroughs – Brooklyn, the Bronx, Manhattan, Queens, and Staten Island – making it a truly New York event. The New York City Marathon has consequently grown from its humble beginning to become one of the world’s largest marathon events, boasting over 50,000 finishers in 2013. There are comparable examples throughout the world, including the Henley Royal Regatta, the Melbourne Cup, and the Tour de France.

In cases like this, the event is linked inextricably to its host destination. The host destination’s brand is extended to cover the event. What is important here is not that the event name includes the name of the host destination; what is important is that the event becomes an explicit element of the destination’s family of brands. In fact, this does not even require that the event include the name of its host destination. Consider the Rose Bowl, which has long been one of the most significant post-season games in American college football. Its brand is closely aligned with Pasadena, the event’s host city, in two ways. First, the facility in which the event takes place is called ‘the Rose Bowl’, which is in Pasadena. Second, the event is preceded each year by the Tournament of Roses Parade during which floats pass through the main streets of Pasadena. The game and the parade each obtain national and international press coverage, which reinforces the link between the city and the event it hosts.

When events can be treated as extensions of the host destination brand, the connection between the two becomes intrinsic. The former exists only in relation to the latter. Just as the event benefits by its association with its host destination, as illustrated by the New York City Marathon, the destination benefits because tourists’ positive associations with the event also become associated with the destination. The principles by which brand image transfer occurs when events are treated as extensions of their host destination brand are comparable to those of co-branding when events and destinations each have strong independent brands (Meyvis and Janiszewski 2004; Swaminathan et al. 2001). That is because in this instance the psychological mechanisms by which associations for each brand are transferred to the other are comparable under strict co-branding and brand extension conditions. The core difference is that when an event is treated as an extension of the host destination brand, the features it shares with other activities and attractions at the destination need to be underscored throughout marketing communications.
There is also a risk when events are treated as extensions of the host destination brand. If an event develops a significant brand of its own, it may also obtain a unique and salient position in the consumer imagination. When that occurs, the event brand could overwhelm the destination brand. This is the case for The Championships at Wimbledon. The name of the host destination, Wimbledon, has come to represent the tennis tournament rather than the destination for most tourists. It has also occurred in the case of the 24 Hours at Le Mans, an auto race that has taken place in and around Le Mans since 1923. The race’s brand has eclipsed the brand of its host destination such that the name of the host destination typically evokes associations with the race rather than the destination, and the race has been able to uncouple itself from its host destination in order to introduce ‘Le Mans Series’ races elsewhere.

The examples of Wimbledon and Le Mans illustrate the necessity of managing the destination brand in concert with the event brand. Growth of the event brand’s associations and saliency must be incorporated in and reflected by growth in the host destination brand's associations and saliency. When a destination hosts events as extensions of its own brand, destination marketers must incorporate those events into a sufficient array of marketing communications formulated to promote the destination. In that way, events can help to build the destination brand. But if events that are initially positioned as extensions of the host destination brand are treated by marketers as separate, then the destination’s brand could eventually be eclipsed or significantly diluted.

Many events lack the growth potential to become useful extensions of their host destination brand. The majority of events obtain insufficient exposure in source tourism markets to cultivate a distinct brand image. Nevertheless, in cases like this, an event can serve as a palpable example of the destination brand’s core attributes. For example, Fort Stockton (a rural west Texas community) annually hosts ‘Water Carnival’, which features aquatic sports and activities (Ziakas and Costa 2010). The event is designed primarily as a local celebration of community history, and it lacks brand equity beyond the town. However, the event’s celebratory atmosphere plays an important role in attracting former residents to visit, and it tangibly represents the community’s tagline, ‘The Friendliest Town in Texas’. Events like this are not suitable for co-branding and they cannot be treated as brand extensions because they lack adequate brand penetration and brand saliency. They can, however, become features of the destination brand to the degree that they are treated as tangible exemplars of one or more of its core attributes. In order to use such events for that purpose they must be built into the destination’s marketing communications as illustrations of the attributes and benefits that the destination provides.

Event portfolios

Destinations typically host more than a single event during the year. This is because the seasonality of tourism mandates events at multiple times of the year in order to fill room-nights (Higham 2005). It is also because a single event – even a high profile sport event – has only a fleeting effect on the destination brand (Ritchie and Smith 1991). Consequently, destinations find it necessary to host events throughout the year, and to find means to synergise them (Ziakas 2014). Events can be cross-promoted so that each event in the destination’s portfolio of events becomes an opportunity to promote tourism to future events. But the value of incorporating a diverse array of events into the destination’s event portfolio goes beyond mere cross-promotion.

The value of events derives from the entire portfolio, rather than from each event individually. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts because the event portfolio determines the reach and frequency through which the host destination is portrayed (Kamin 1978). Since different events appeal to different market segments, hosting an array of sport events enables exposure of the destination to a greater number of segments than could be obtained through a single type of
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sport event. Thus, an event portfolio with a diverse group of sport events is necessary to optimise the reach of event-derived destination marketing communications. Similarly, by having events throughout the year, marketing messages about the destination and its brand are repeated. Thus, a portfolio of events that are offered throughout the year is necessary to optimise the frequency with which event-based messages reach target audiences.

The portfolio of events that a destination offers typically grows haphazardly and opportunistically. It is rare for host destinations to devise a strategically formulated event portfolio. In part, this is because each event proffers significant challenges that become the focus of organisers’ attention. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, for organisers of any one event to devote time to strategic planning for other events in the portfolio, even if it could be advantageous for them. Further, at most destinations, sport events are acquired and organised by different organisations (see Chapter 5 in this Handbook for more information on event owners), so it is challenging to treat them as belonging to a single portfolio. For example, local sports organisations may host events in their sport, parks and recreation organisations may host some events, private sport entrepreneurs may host events, schools may host sport events, religious organisations may host sport events, etc. The events each organisation hosts are likely to be important to the host organisation. Cooperating in a shared effort to strategically leverage the mix of events being offered can feel like a threat to the autonomy of each organisation. Thus, creation and management of an event portfolio becomes a task of stakeholder coordination.

Concluding observations

In 2000, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) launched a project that they dubbed ‘Olympic Games Global Impact’. Recognising the disappointments accruing from the aftermaths of sport events, especially the failure to realise the range and level of expected benefits from mega-events like the Olympic Games (Cashman 2006; Kissoudi 2008; Pentifallo and Van Wynsbergh 2014), the aim has been to find and create desirable gains from sport events. This project has endeavoured to advance an agenda for event organisers to formulate and implement plans that will render positive legacies from events for the host destination. This agenda has resulted in a flurry of work endeavouring to theorise and describe event legacies (e.g., Gratton and Preuss 2008; Thomson et al. 2013). Tourism is included among the significant legacies that sport events can enable.

It would be wrong to argue against seeking positive outcomes from sport events, including tourism to the host destination. Nevertheless, the legacy framework has come under sharp criticism. Legacies of sport events like the Olympic Games rarely live up to the promises made about them, even when there is substantial planning for legacy (Cashman 2006). Legacy discourse is framed in a rhetoric focused on event organising and on the franchisor/franchisee relationship that reinforces the hierarchy of power that event owners enjoy over event organising committees (MacAloon 2008). Concentrating on legacy as a responsibility for event organisers deflects responsibility from those who are best positioned to leverage positive outcomes for the host destination, such as local businesses, local government, local trade associations, and local NGOs (Chalip 2014). After all, event organisers must stage their event successfully; legacies are secondary to that goal (see also Chapter 3 in this Handbook). Any responsibility for legacies is not merely a distraction for event organisers; it is an added expense and a potential impediment to the necessary focus on event planning and implementation. Even if event organisers can and do take up legacy planning, their organising committee is normally disbanded (in the case of one-off events) or temporarily downsized (in the case of recurring events), which can make legacy development unsustainable.
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The foregoing description of the ways that sport events can support tourism development amplifies these criticisms. Events are useful for tourism when destination planners and marketers work in concert with event organisers. Although event organisers can cooperate and facilitate the process of bringing each event into the marketing mix for the host destination, destination marketers have primary responsibility for the tasks of envisioning tourism objectives, building events into destination branding, enabling the destination brand to aid event branding, and managing event portfolios. Given the array of local organisations that organise sport events and the wide array of businesses with a stake in tourism (e.g., restaurants, hotels, motels, retailers, and tour operators), effective use of events for tourism development requires determined stakeholder management. Strategic leverage of sport events for tourism is not mere legacy planning. Effective partnerships between event organisers and destination marketers are more likely to result from a focus on leverage than a focus on legacy.

The ways that events contribute to tourism, and the means to use tourism marketing to promote events are not yet adequately understood. Among the questions in urgent need of research are the following ten:

1. How do the demographics and psychographics of event attendees differ from those of aversion, diversion, and accompanying market segments? How can that information inform strategies for dealing with those market segments?
2. How do the demographics and psychographics of secondary event attendees differ from those of primary event attendees? How do the relationships among demographics and psychographics of primary and secondary event attendees differ? What are the implications for marketing to primary versus secondary event attendees?
3. How can bundling destination experiences with the event most effectively create synergies between sport events and host destinations? How do variations in bundling strategies affect aggregate event visitor spend?
4. How, when, and why do the culture at the host destination and the sport subculture affect tourists’ choices when considering whether or not to attend a sport event? What difference does long-haul versus short-haul travel make in their decision process?
5. How do the tourism wants and needs of sport event attendees differ from those of mainstream leisure tourists?
6. How can incorporating adjunct events into a sport event, particularly when arts or cultural events are added, become most effective for overall event marketing? How is the quality of visitor experience affected? What is the effect of sport subculture?
7. What differences for tourism marketing and destination branding are engendered by one-off events versus repeat events? How much of that difference can be attributed to event size versus whether or not the event recurs at the destination?
8. What can be done to optimise transfer of desirable event brand elements to the destination brand, and vice versa? What enables effective synergies among publicity, advertising, and social media in that task? How can negative co-branding effects be minimised or prevented?
9. When designing and managing an event portfolio, what are optimal guidelines for target reach and frequency of messages about the host destination to be communicated through the collection of events?
10. What strategies and tactics enable creation and maintenance of the necessary partnerships among stakeholders to enable event leverage for purposes of tourism development? In particular, what can be done to build and sustain the necessary alliances between sport organisations, including event organisers, and tourism marketers?
In order for sport events to capitalise on tourism, and for tourism development to benefit from sport events, appropriate strategies and tactics must be formulated and implemented. That requires event organisers to create and sustain relationships with destination marketers, and destination marketers to build the local portfolio of events into the destination marketing mix. This is a paradigm shift away from the now outmoded foci on event impacts, and it is a subtle but significant shift from the currently popular legacy framework, particularly as it has been promulgated by the IOC. Strategic leveraging of events can foster tourism. Future research can enhance that capability.
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