WHAT ATTRACTS FANS TO A VENUE? ¹

Kirk Wakefield

Introduction

The study of person, place and situation-based factors influencing sport consumption behaviours is now a relatively rich field of research. Yet, until the early 1990s, limited empirical evidence existed beyond aggregate economic models of fan attendance to explain fan behaviour. These models (e.g., Noll, 1974) did little to explain why small town markets (e.g., St Louis Cardinals) or perennial losers (e.g., Chicago Cubs) could continue to attract millions of fans. What is it about these places that attracts proportionately more fans than economic models would predict? Clearly, something besides population size, competition, prices, income levels and team performance influences attendance.

The basic research question then and now is: what attracts individuals to places? Such a fundamental question provides researchers with the proper scope to examine literature in relevant fields to build upon and enhance theory. The question is not, ‘what drives fan attendance?’ – although this is the practical, managerial question addressed. Such a narrow scope would limit the application, influence and impact to be field specific.

Overview of the sportscape

The sportscape refers to the built or fixed elements of the physical environment of a sporting event that remain the same from game to game. The sportscape includes every tangible element fans encounter as they approach the exterior of a facility, enter and navigate through the interior of the facility, and subsequently exit. The exterior layout includes the facility’s design and location of parking lots and the aesthetic appeal of the facility architecture. The interior layout and design includes (a) layout accessibility, which is a function of wayfinding signage and space allocation, (b) seat comfort and (c) scoreboards.

In work done with Sloan, we investigated the response of individuals to other elements of the (football) stadium experience that may be more transient, including food service quality and variety, fan control, cleanliness and perceived crowding (Wakefield and Sloan, 1995; see also Harrell, Hutt and Anderson, 1980; Stokals 1972). Later, Blodgett and I (Wakefield and Blodgett, 1996) examined the effects of layout, aesthetics, seating, electronic displays and cleanliness on individuals’ overall perceptions of facility quality and subsequent satisfaction and behavioural
intentions in both football, baseball stadiums and casinos. We also examined the effects of the physical environment (building design, décor and equipment), adding the effects of ambience (cleanliness, temperature, employee appearance) and service quality (Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, 1988) experienced at sporting events (hockey) to predict attendance (Wakefield and Blodgett, 1999). These findings also applied to other entertainment settings, including movie theatres and recreation centres. In a shopping centre setting, Baker and I investigated the effects of the layout, interior design and décor, but also examined ambient effects of music, lighting and temperature on individual’s response to the environment (Wakefield and Baker, 1998). Hence, the elements of the physical environment examined within the sportscape also apply within other shopping and entertainment settings.

Figure 23.1 illustrates an S-O-R (stimulus-organism-response) framework with all of the elements of the physical environment and service environment individuals encounter attending a sporting event, and subsequent cognitive, affective and behavioural responses. The organism – the individual fan – may respond differently to various sportscape stimuli dependent upon individual characteristics (e.g., loyalty to the team; season ticket holder vs. individual ticket buyer) and situations (e.g., regular season vs. playoffs).

Little work has been done in the area of individual and situational moderating variables that explain why fans can look at the same place but perceive it in entirely different lights. Strombeck and I (2008), for example, found that individuals evaluated the physical environment and service quality differently dependent upon the stage in the service delivery – from approach and entrance throughout the experience until exit – and the service received at each stage. Such effects are likely in sportscape settings where individuals may gain relatively negative or positive perceptions at each step of the fan journey:

- Parking lot → Admission → Food service → Seating → Restrooms →
- Team store → Facility exit → Parking exit

Thus, although we know the physical environment has predictable influences, across a wide variety of sports and service settings, on how individuals perceive places and respond emotionally and behaviourally, we know less about the boundaries under which these effects might vary rather dramatically. Since the sportscape and much of the servicescape research is conducted in relatively hedonic environments, we are less certain how the same individual who responds to stimuli in these settings is more or less influenced by the environment in more utilitarian settings (see Wakefield and Blodgett, 1994).

**Process**

The St Louis Cardinals organisation was one of the first professional sports teams to take a truly market-oriented approach (viz., Kohli and Jaworski, 1990) to serving fans. As fate would have it, my dissertation at Saint Louis University (1991) on control systems for the market-oriented firm coincided with a stint working as a secret shopper for the St Louis Cardinals. The secret shopper programme was aimed at providing and measuring excellent customer service at every point in the experience, from the appearance of the parking lot facilities, to entering old Busch Stadium, to sitting in the seats, to timing each food service line, to checking on the cleanliness of the restrooms in the seventh inning, to the exit from the parking facilities. The practice of the secret shopper programme directly applied to the subject of my dissertation – how to maintain a customer-oriented service approach. While completing the PhD, I determined to explore these variables and anything else that might predict fan satisfaction and attendance.
Gaining co-operation

Upon arriving at Ole Miss to begin my academic career, spurred on by co-author Hugh Sloan, we made an initial visit to the athletic department to explore collaborative research opportunities. With the help of the athletic director, we gained support from a number of Southeastern Conference programmes to explore the influence of the stadium experience on fan attendance. Keys to gaining co-operation were (a) familiarity and experience in the field, and (b) asking interesting research questions with direct application to the bottom line. While not everyone can be a major league secret shopper, many have retailing and other experiences directly applicable that provide credibility.

Gaining expertise

One way to gain expertise and credibility is to proactively build a network of relationships and experiences that provide insight to others in the industry. I did this in two ways.

First, as part of a video-experimental design, a road trip was in order to videotape every aspect of five stadiums each from the same vantage points – from St Louis to Pittsburgh (Three Rivers Stadium), Cincinnati (Riverfront Park), Cleveland (Municipal Park) and Detroit (Tiger Stadium). Fan interviews revealed what they liked and didn’t like about the parks. Meetings with executives for each team provided more insight. The result of the videotaped experiments using the Cincinnati and Cleveland videos for contrast is reported in our first publication on the subject (Wakefield and Blodgett, 1994).

Second, any minor league team within a few hours driving distance, including the Memphis Chicks (AA), Memphis Redbirds (AAA), Memphis Maddogs (CFL, defunct), Huntsville Stars

Figure 23.1 Sportscape S-O-R framework
(AA), Memphis Riverkings (CHL) and Jackson Generals (AA), became familiar locations for student projects and research studies. Integrating fan research into courses, using on-campus and nearby venues, became common practice to help students understand consumer behaviour and as a way to collect unique data. The teams benefited by understanding what aspects of the venue experience needed improvement and understanding the relative role of facilities on attendance. In one case, the CHL used data collected among fans in the DFW area to maintain the Ft Worth franchise (the Fire, who played in the Fort Worth Convention Center) and to close the Dallas (Freeze) franchise that played at the dark and dank Fair Park Coliseum.

These studies were often combined with another study of practical interest to the team, such as a service quality survey. The key in working with teams is to first help solve a pressing problem. Sometimes this was as simple as learning where fans searched for information about games or preferred starting times. Other times, the problems were more complex, which led to other fan research regarding social influence (Wakefield, 1993), promotion value (Wakefield and Bush, 1998), promotion proneness (Wakefield and Barnes, 1996), sponsorship recall (Wakefield, Becker-Olsen and Cornwell, 2007; Wakefield and Bennett, 2010) and dysfunctional fans (Wakefield and Wann, 2006).

Gaining theory

Environmental psychology provides the theoretical background for research regarding approach-avoidance in physical environments, yet we must dig a much deeper theoretical hole to understand its source. Doing so provides a richer understanding of why processes and relationships work as they do and offers avenues to conduct research that potentially impacts broader disciplines including psychology, sociology, business and economics.

The built elements of the sportscape, inclusive of the interior and exterior layout and design of a stadium, are derived from the more general study of how individuals respond to servicescapes (Bitner, 1992) as the tangible component of the service delivery (viz., Baker, 1986; Parasuraman et al., 1988). The foundation for studying service environments, sport or otherwise, lies within the approach-avoidance framework of Russell and Mehrabian (1976; Mehrabian and Russell, 1974). The approach-avoidance framework originated from studies measuring the psychological and emotional responses to a variety of stimuli via semantic differentials (Osgood and Suci, 1955), applied specifically to elements of the physical environment. The use of semantic differentials to measure the response to stimuli emerged from the work of Osgood (1952) and his colleagues’ (Karwoski, Odbert and Osgood, 1942) study of ‘synesthetic thinking’ that explains the process of translating musical stimuli to visual responses – such that when one hears music (or other stimuli) one assigns meaning along a continuum of polar opposites. The result of their work was the first use of semantic differentials to measure the meanings people assign to stimuli they experience. Figure 23.2 illustrates the theoretical progression leading to the study of the sportscape.

Study of the built environment in services marketing is also heavily reliant upon the work within marketing on atmospherics and other tangible cues that influence individual behaviour. In particular, Harrell et al. (1980) examined the causal links between one’s feeling that others are intruding upon one’s space – psychological crowding (Stokols, 1972) – and physical density (the number of others in a given space) to learn that individuals employ adaptive strategies (e.g., deviate from plans, [in]complete purchases) that influence key outcomes (e.g., satisfaction and enjoyment associated with the experience).

Applying the same theory to the physical environment of sporting events, we would expect that fans feeling confined or closed in due to cramped space in the corridors, aisles or seats
might deviate from the time they planned to spend at an event, forego merchandise purchases they intended to make, and decide then and there not to return again. Alternatively, in facilities with a more open design that reduces physical density and allows for free movement to reach one’s desired destination, we can expect fans to spend more time, purchase more, enjoy the experience and want to frequently return. In short, this is what our series of sportscape-related studies have found.

As with any meaningful research stream, the contribution of these servicescape and sportscape studies is threefold in terms of theory, method and practice. First, the broader services literature was dominated by SERVQUAL (Parasuraman et al., 1988) throughout the 1990s with an emphasis on service quality provided by employees, but with scant attention to the influence of the environment on consumer cognitions, affect and behaviour. Studies in the sportscape setting established that the physical environment is often as much or more important than employee service in determining consumer behaviour. This work includes studies regarding sporting events but positioned in terms of hedonic consumption (Wakefield and Barnes, 1996) and then applied in other retail environments such as movie theatres and casinos (Wakefield and Blodgett, 1999) and shopping centres (Wakefield and Baker, 1998). Without substantive consideration of the tangible, built environment, the conceptualisation and measurement of an organisation’s service delivery is incomplete and would offer less reliability in predicting affective and behavioural outcomes associated with the service experience.

Second, from a methodological perspective, elements of the sportscape are delineated, defined and measured with reliable and valid scales to predict affective and behavioural responses to the environment. The sportscape scales allow researchers and practitioners to discriminate between relative effects of seating comfort, scoreboard quality, layout design, space allocation, wayfinding signage, interior décor and design, and parking accessibility to determine which of these influences consumer response in a given setting. Prior servicescape and service quality research lacked specificity and combined unrelated elements observed in the physical environment, including the appearance of personnel, physical facilities and equipment (see Parasuraman et al., 1988).

In many ways, the relative effects of the tangible and intangible aspects of service delivery remain poorly understood, as researchers continue to ignore appropriate measurement and inclusion of key service environment factors in hotels (e.g., Sánchez-Hernández, Martínez-Tur, Peiró and Ramos, 2009), hospitals (e.g., Pilgrimiene and Rutelione, 2013), retailing (e.g., Meng, Summey, Herndon and Kwong, 2009), high tech services (He and Li, 2011), sport tourism (e.g., Costa, Glinia and Drakou, 2004) and managing sports (e.g., Theodorakis and Alexandris, 2008). The two mistakes common to these (and more) studies is the omission of elements likely to influence perceptions of the environment and treating general elements (appearance of
personnel, physical facilities, etc.) as one generic ‘tangibles’ construct that includes anything that
doesn’t involve employee–customer interaction.

Third, as a practical matter, the stream of research launched from study of the sportscape
has offered some guidance through further replication, extensions and adaptations in the field
of sport management. Thomson-Reuters Web of Science can map a stream of research looking
forward from the original article (Wakefield, Blodgett and Sloan, 1996). Most of the article’s
subsequent (140+) citations appear in the sport management literature, including many in the
Journal of Sport Management and Sport Management Review. Some reach into the broader services
and business literature and links to the downstream impact stemming from this research into
the fields of services and retailing (e.g., Wakefield and Baker, 1998; Wakefield and Blodgett,
1999).

Extensions, applications and future research

The importance of the sportscape in determining fan satisfaction has been incorporated into a
variety of extensions and applications. Relevant findings of three key studies are summarised
here, followed by suggestions for future research relevant to each study. I conclude with a
summary of a fourth study incorporating the sportscape, making methodological recom-
men-dations for future studies.

Extending sportscape

League brand associations

In building a conceptual understanding of consumers’ perceptions of a league’s brand associations,
Kunkel, Funk and King (2014) incorporate the quality of the atmosphere in the league’s stadiums.
As these authors note, ‘the atmosphere surrounding games is one of the most important motives
to attend league games . . . as consumers do not take anything away from games other than
memories of their experience’ (p. 59).

In general, investigating perceptions of brand attributes associated with leagues is fertile ground
for future research, as most empirical work regarding fan perceptions focuses on teams, venues
or players. With respect to understanding the effects of physical surroundings on perceptions
of leagues, opportunity exists to develop multiple-item scales amenable to understanding how
fans holistically view the quality of various leagues. For example, perceptions of minor leagues
may be proportionately more influenced by the quality of the facilities than by the other brand
associations studied by Kunkel et al. (2014). In particular, minor league baseball appears to have
enhanced brand perceptions due to the influx of fan-friendly stadiums managed by customer-
centric owners such as Mandalay Entertainment.

In contrast, facilities hosting dirt track racing (itself an under-studied venue and fan base)
may suffer from poor perceptions of facilities that hinder expansion to attract new customers.
Alternatively, unknown are the reasons some fans are willing to attend venues with relatively
uncomfortable seats, cramped spaces and overall poor amenities, as are often found at racing
facilities.

Fan satisfaction

Aimed at explaining overall fan satisfaction (FANSAT) at the venue level for soccer clubs, Sarstedt,
Ringle, Raithel and Gudergan (2014) incorporated and compared elements of the sportscape
with other antecedents of fan satisfaction, such as team characteristics, competitor characteristics, stadium security, peripheral services, fan-based activities and club characteristics. Results of their field studies indicated that, relative to these other factors, the sportscape is the strongest predictor of fan satisfaction and subsequent attendance. While we might expect this to be the case, an interesting question is whether the sportscape matters more or less across different venues where season ticket holders would be expected to spend more or less time.

The number of regular season home games for NCAA football (six), NFL (eight), MLS (17), NHL and NBA (41), and MLB (81) might suggest that the importance of the sportscape would increase where frequent fans would spend more time. While difficult to accomplish, no research to date has attempted to determine the relative importance of the built environment relative to other services across the various sportsscapes. One way to assess such effects would be to keep the venue the same, but study fans attending different events. For example, some facilities may host NBA, NHL, arena football, rodeos and concerts. Administering otherwise identical surveys, such as the FANSAT to representative samples across these settings, may reveal differences across single-event buyers to season ticket holders who attend every game, but one must also account for overlap among patrons at each event. The latter issue, attendance at the same venue for multiple purposes and accounting for cross-selling of events, offers another avenue for research.

Further, as Sarstedt et al. (2014) note, analysis accounting for the heterogeneity among fans, by clustering or segmenting them, may reveal differences in the relative influence of factors on fan satisfaction. In particular, one might expect that the sportscape is perceived differently by season ticket holders versus other segments. Similarly, fan categories, such as those identified by Harris and Ogbonna (2008), might differ in sportscape perceptions and relevant influences on satisfaction and attendance. For example, among the seven fan categories of English Premier League fans (armchair supporters, social fans, oldtimers, leisure switchers, antifans, club-connected supporters and die-hard fanatic) identified, we might expect the ‘oldtimers’ to perceive the venue differently from ‘antifans’.

**Sensoryscape**

One explanation for why some individuals are willing to endure objectively inferior facilities (i.e., those that are visually unappealing or physically uncomfortable), is that other elements of the sensoryscape – sounds, smells and tastes – may compensate. Lee, Heere and Kyu-soo (2013) expanded upon the early work on sportsscapes (Wakefield and Sloan, 1995; Wakefield, Blodgett and Sloan 1996) to include other sensory elements such as the (a) sounds of the cheering, music and scoreboard, (b) smells of the stadium, crowd, food and tailgating and (c) the tastes of the food and drinks.

Lee et al. (2012) found that the overall sensoryscape has the strongest influence on fan satisfaction compared with the effects of social interaction and one’s sense of the place feeling like home to them. However, it may be that for some fans in some venues – again, perhaps in some sports – the relative effects of social interaction and being on home turf is enough to make up for poor facilities. That said, we would expect superior facilities to capitalise on such strong social ties and community feelings.

As Lee and colleagues (Lee et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2012) suggest, we know little regarding how teams might take advantage of the spectators themselves to enhance the stadium experience. Within the United States, fans observing World Cup, Premiere League and Major League Soccer matches seem to be adopting the more active fan behaviours (e.g., chanting, singing, costumes, etc.) and practising them at other non-soccer events. Organisations that facilitate such practices
may be able to increase fan satisfaction in relatively cost-efficient ways compared with investing in physical facilities.

On a more micro-level, exploring the effects of the senses on individual consumers in sports settings offers a fruitful line of enquiry. For example, the work of Peck and her associates (Peck and Childers, 2003a, 2003b; Peck and Wiggins, 2006; Peck and Johnson, 2011; Peck, Barger and Webb, 2013) on haptic information – or information attained by touching with the hands – suggests that perhaps just the way a hotdog feels in the hands of a fan might matter. Its texture, hardness, temperature and weight (not to mention tastes) are all aspects of haptics that could influence fan responses to concession experiences.

A common experience at sporting events, and of importance to teams and corporate partners, is physical interactions with brands, such as automobile displays where fans are invited to touch, sit, inspect and then interact with staff and others in the venue regarding the automobile. Peck et al. (2013) found, for instance, that simply touching an object creates feelings of ownership and that even imagining touching may have similar effects. Such findings extended to sponsors of interactive displays at sports venues may offer added value to such partnership packages.

Methodological and modelling? Considerations

Yoshida and James (2010) incorporate the sportscape into a model of relationships between service satisfaction and game satisfaction that determines fan behavioural intentions. Their work emphasises a key principle of sport marketing – that customer service consists of the core service (aspects related to the game) and ancillary services controlled by management (facility and service quality). We might argue that game atmosphere is partially controlled by management and is partially uncontrollable owing to heterogeneous fan behaviour at sporting events. Based on studies conducted among Japanese professional baseball and United States football spectators, the authors found game satisfaction to strongly influence behavioural intentions, but service satisfaction only influenced behavioural intentions in the Japanese baseball setting.

Yoshida and James’ (2010) work offers the opportunity to raise important theoretical and modelling issues. In their work, they found that facility space had no significant effect on service satisfaction. However, this should be expected as, in the original sportscape model (Wakefield 2003a, 2003b; Peck and Wiggins, 2006; Peck and Johnson, 2011; Peck, Barger and Webb, 2013) on haptic information – or information attained by touching with the hands – suggests that perhaps just the way a hotdog feels in the hands of a fan might matter. Its texture, hardness, temperature and weight (not to mention tastes) are all aspects of haptics that could influence fan responses to concession experiences.
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et al., 1996; see Figure 23.3), space allocation influences fans’ perceptions of layout accessibility, which in turn influences perceived crowding and subsequently influences pleasure (or satisfaction) and behavioural responses. Hence, the ultimate effects of some sportscape elements may be mediated by other perceptions and affective responses.

First, care must be taken to appropriately model the relationships between perceptions of the physical environment and psychological constructs such as perceived crowding and affective responses (Russell and Pratt, 1980). Failing to do so may underestimate the indirect effects.

Second, care must be taken to include some measure of fan loyalty (Wakefield and Sloan, 1995) to account for other motives. Yoshida and James (2010) tested another hierarchical model controlling for game attendance, thereby better accounting for the variance explained by service and game satisfaction.

Third, little effort has been made in the sport management literature to formally test mediating and moderating effects. In fact, studies in the sport domain in sport-dominant journals have done little to follow common experimental methods. As Lynch et al. (2012) argue, the modal approach in consumer research may sacrifice relevance for the value of complexity (Lehmann, McAlister and Staelin, 2011). Consumer researchers may have gone overboard in testing hypothesised relationships using experiments, aimed at providing process evidence through a series of moderation and mediation tests. However, research in sport-related contexts has made little effort to consider the appropriate psychological processes by which fans respond to stimuli – such as those encountered in sports facilities. Hence, we could use more of an experimental approach in our approach to understanding sports fans.

None of the studies reported in this chapter have taken an experimental approach to separating out the individual effects and the underlying processes. For example, do the perceptions fans have regarding the sportscape mediate or moderate the effects of passion fans have for the team and their desire to attend and stay at games?

We (Wakefield and Sloan, 1995) suggest that team loyalty moderates sportscape-related effects on desire to stay and intentions to attend, but this was not tested. As Figure 23.3 illustrates, we might find that loyalty to the team directly influences perceptions of the sportscape (path A) and directly influences behaviour (path C), and that the sportscape also directly influences behaviour (path B). In this case, we would expect complementary mediation, where the mediated effect (A × B) and the direct effect (C) are significant. Appropriate tests for mediation using a bootstrap test of the indirect effect (A × B) can be found in Zhao, Lynch and Chen (2010).

Alternatively, we might believe another variable moderates the strength of the relationships in the model. For example, the team loyalty→sportscape (path A) could be tested to determine if length of time one has been a season ticket holder moderates the path such that the longer one has a season ticket the stronger the effect of loyalty on perceptions of the sportscape. Further, the moderating effect may be negative (positive), such that the longer one is a season ticket holder the worse (better) the attitude towards the physical facilities. In a structural equation model using software such as Smart PLS, these interaction effects are easily constructed (see Ringle, Wende and Will, 2005).

Conclusion

In many ways, our understanding of the processes by which physical surroundings determine individuals’ responses in sports settings remains at a basic level. We know the stadium and its various sportscape components – including the built and service environment – influence affective and behavioural responses among fans. What we don’t know much about is how individual elements of the sportscape (tangibles and intangibles) influence response.
We know at a general level that the appearance of various sportscape and service components influences perceptions and subsequent affective responses. Yet, we don’t know how it influences these responses.

For example, the work of Russell and his colleagues (Widen, Christy, Hewett and Russell, 2011; Yik, Widen and Russell, 2013) finds that individuals may identify emotions of disgust, shame, embarrassment, compassion and contempt by observing others’ facial expressions. However, age or other factors may lead individuals to interpret what the majority view as the ‘disgust’ face as anger (Widen and Russell, 2008). In a sport service setting where staff must deal with complaining behaviour, how are their facial expressions interpreted by fans? How might service personnel say (‘No problem, we will clean that mess right up’) with facial expressions? Studies investigating such issues provide deep insight into broader consumer behaviour while also informing sport management regarding recruitment, selection, training and retention of service personnel.

Similar in-depth studies could be conducted with virtually each element of the sportscape, delving into the deeper psychological and physiological reactions to stimuli in the sport environment.

Note

1 This chapter is a reflection on Wakefield, Blodgett and Sloan (1996) and the work related to it.
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The sportscape concept developed by Kirk Wakefield and colleagues has been influential in understanding how the different elements of sports facilities influence various sport consumer behaviours. I was initially introduced to this work in 1999 as a doctoral student. Prior to beginning my doctoral studies, I had worked in college athletics where I was responsible for meeting attendance goals for multiple sports playing at five different facilities. Not having any control over the quality of the teams I marketed, I became keenly aware of the role other elements, such as the facility, played in driving attendance. As such I was interested in researching how sports facilities contributed to whether or not consumers would attend various events. Considering the changing environment in spectator sports (new facilities, rising customer expectations, increased demands on event marketers) it was becoming more important to understand the role of the sport environment.

At the time, the understanding of the influence of sport facilities was incomplete. While many scholars had addressed the role of the facility, results were often limited as they tended to use incomplete measures to address perceptions of sport facilities. Further, much of the research in this area had suggested that sports facilities had little influence on spectators’ enjoyment or consumption behaviours. Research on the sportscape was different in that it included a more complete set of facility factors and multiple outcomes to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the various elements of sport venues and how those elements influenced sport consumers. The sportscape, therefore, became a key piece of my research agenda.

In my own research, I was able to utilise Wakefield’s sportscape research to address some of the aforementioned controversies in the sport management literature. Specifically, by employing the sportscape, we were able to understand the role of the facility relative to other elements of the service encounter. We found the sportscape had a significant influence on customer satisfaction. Customer demographic profiles and levels of team identification also affected these dynamics. The multidimensional nature of the sportscape was also confirmed in later research into the critical aspects of service encounters. In this research, my colleagues and I were able to
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illustrate how the various aspects of the facility could influence both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with a sport experience.

This research has also been valuable in my work with local sport organisations. Working mostly with organisations that would fall under the banner of niche sports, my colleagues and I have been able to illustrate what organisations, who typically don’t have star players, can do with their facilities to provide a great experience for their consumers. Similarly, this concept has been an important element of the courses I teach on sport marketing and event management. Considering sport consumers may spend hours in the facility and the importance this generation’s sports consumers place on facilities, it is vital for students to understand the various elements of the sportscape and how these elements can be managed to maximise customer satisfaction.
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