





# Athletes' perception of perceived quality at the CESA BM 2022

 Liam Cano-Coyle . Department of Physical Activity and Sports. University of Murcia. Spain.  
 José Miguel Vegara Ferri. Department of Physical Activity and Sports. University of Murcia. Spain.  
 José María López Gullón. Department of Physical Activity and Sports. University of Murcia. Spain.

## ABSTRACT

Nowadays, numerous sporting events of diverse nature take place every week. This highlights the importance of conducting studies to assess their quality and determine the best event to participate in. Obtaining this information will allow organisers and managers to improve the services offered in order to meet the growing demands of users. The purpose of this study was to analyse the perception of quality by the athletes who attended and participated in the Campeonato de España de Selecciones Autonómicas de Balonmano 2022 (CESA BM 2022), with a gender breakdown. The sample consisted of 514 athletes. Data collection was carried out telematically by means of an online survey using the "Encuestas" tool of the University of Murcia. Perceived quality elements were assessed, as well as the importance of performance, segregated by gender and category of participation. The main results revealed that for athletes, the best rated dimension was "Future intentions", while the worst was "Perceived value". Some conclusions drawn from this study include that the female gender of the sample perceived higher quality compared to the male gender. It was also observed that players in the infantile category perceived higher quality than cadets and juniors, and statistically significant differences were also found between the various elements of the study.

**Keywords:** Impression, Sport event, Manager, Gender, Handball.

### Cite this article as:

Cano-Coyle, L., Vegara Ferri, J. M., & López Gullón, J. M. (2025). Athletes' perception of perceived quality at the CESA BM 2022. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, 20(1), 280-289. <https://doi.org/10.55860/r0pchz89>

 **Corresponding author.** Department of Physical Activity and Sports. University of Murcia. Spain.

E-mail: [liamjose.canoc@um.es](mailto:liamjose.canoc@um.es)

Submitted for publication June 18, 2024.

Accepted for publication July 27, 2024.

Published December 08, 2024.

[Journal of Human Sport and Exercise](#). ISSN 1988-5202.

©Asociación Española de Análisis del Rendimiento Deportivo. Alicante. Spain.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.55860/r0pchz89>

## INTRODUCTION

Sporting events have a significant impact on the social life of the community, while promoting sport and physical activity, improving the quality of life of citizens. They also play a key role in the economic and tourism development of the organising locality. In the field of sport management, it is possible to identify and classify sport events in various ways, such as their type, scale or target audience. In this study, a national sport event will be analysed, specifically a Spanish Championship by Autonomous Communities, which belongs to the grassroots category. These events are attractive for municipalities, as they attract young people from all Spanish regions for one week and it is a great way to increase the popularity of the municipality. At the same time, family and friends of the participants also come to the town to support the athletes and take advantage of the opportunity for local tourism.

With an increase in demand comes an increase in supply, so quality is becoming an imperative need for companies in terms of developing strategies that allow them to stand out in a competitive market (Gálvez and Morales-Sánchez, 2011; Reyes-Robles, et al. 2022). When talking about quality, it is important to mention what Llorens and Fuentes (2000) stated, some organizations and experts have searched for a definition for the concept of quality, but the truth is that there is no concrete definition that can be determined as the best one. Perceived quality can be defined as the judgement created by users, based on individual interests and expectations in relation to the service obtained. Furthermore, if a review of the scientific literature is made, other accepted meanings can be found, such as: “consumers” overall impression of the relative superiority or inferiority of a company and its services’ (Bitner and Hubber, 1994, p.7). Zeithaml (1988) defines it as the “*consumer's judgement of the excellence or superiority of a product or service*”.

Quality is seen as a point of differentiation within the sports industry, which can lead to greater satisfaction of both loyal users and future customers, as well as to the enhancement of one's own corporate image (Afthinos et al., 2005; Chelladurai and Chang, 2000 and Parasunaman et al., 1985). For this reason, one of the main objectives of companies today is to maintain customer loyalty and provide additional value to their products or services (Tsitskari et al., 2006). The importance of measuring the service quality is explained by Calabuig et al. (2010), who point out that the study of the elements of satisfaction will provide organisations with greater loyalty and organisational improvement in their sports projects.

After an extensive review of perceived quality from the academic literature there are some results that are interesting. Related to the perceived quality of athletes a study was carried out by Ballesteros (2019), whose work was articulated with the CAPPEP tool (Angosto, 2016a). This study aimed to evaluate the perceived service quality of the participating athletes and correlate it with sociodemographic variables at the XVII Half Marathon in 2018 to improve future editions. The perceived quality of the athletes was defined as “good”, and could be “*excellent*”, as this is what the athletes' sporting level demands.

In relation to the participant's perception, Vegara-Ferri, Carboneros and Angosto (2021), carried out a study in which the objective was to evaluate the perception of the participating sports tourists on the quality of the event, socio-cultural perception, destination image and future intentions, comparing the possible differences between national and foreign tourists participating in an international nautical event. Some of the conclusions obtained were that the highest rated item is the socio-cultural perception followed by the intentions to return to the event and to the host town. On the other hand, the perception of the quality and image of the event are the worst rated of the event.

A study carried out by Vicente, Cerro-Herrero, Angosto and Prieto-Prieto (2021), has as one of its objectives to analyse the quality perceived by trail runners and to identify the socio-sportive factors that determine the quality of the event. The data collection was done with the (CAPPEP) of Angosto et al. (2016a) and as results it was determined that: some of the conditions that determine the quality of an event are related to socio-sporting factors of the athlete, such as their level of studies or their federated status; some of the factors of higher perceived quality in this event were the treatment with the staff as well as the factors inherent to the development of the event; however, the worst rated factor was the complementary services to the event.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### ***Participants***

The group of athletes was composed of 514 subjects, including 240 males and 274 females who competed in the following age groups: Infantile male and female, composed of children 12-13 years old; Cadet male and female, composed of children 14-15 years old; and Junior male and female, where young people up to 17 years old competed. Some interesting data collected from this sample are as follows: 19.5% have been playing handball for 5 years or less, 68.8% have been playing for between 6 and 10 years, and 11.7% have been playing for more than 10 years; it can also be seen that the sample is very evenly distributed among the categories, with a 32.1% response from Infantile, 34% from Cadets, and 33.9% from Juniors; in reference to the weekly training of the respondents, more than half of them (54.3%) train between 6 and 10 hours a week; finally, among other characteristics, it can be seen that 57.8% of the respondents have competed in past editions of the CESA BM.

### ***Research instruments***

The survey used for this study was CAPEPP (Angosto, 2014) to which the importance of performance variable proposed by Hyun and Jordan (2019) was added. The CAPPEP questionnaire is divided into two sections. The first section, "*Perceived quality*", consisted of ten items divided into four dimensions: communication, staff, logistical organisation and complementary services. A second section "*General quality*" was composed of five items, divided into four dimensions: general quality of the event, perceived value, satisfaction and future intentions.

The response scale was a five-point Likert-type scale (1- Strongly disagree; 7- Strongly agree) for both tools. Finally, socio-demographic and sporting variables were included, such as age, gender, studies completed, autonomous community in which the respondent resides, time practising handball and category in which he/she participates; this first part was also completed with some questions on time spent practising sport and questions related to the organisation of CESA BM 22.

### ***Procedure***

The procedure carried out to develop this research study consisted, firstly, of a review of the existing literature on perceived quality and the instruments used to identify which tools are most suitable for assessing participants in an event. Finally, it was decided that the most suitable instrument for this work would CAPPEP (2016). Subsequently, once the evaluation instrument had been identified, the event organisers were contacted to inform them of the interest in carrying out an evaluation study of the event, the objectives and the evaluation tools. In the second phase, the survey was passed out to athletes of the CESA BM 22 by the selection delegate. The questionnaires were administered the 13-15th April with a link, which redirected respondents to the relevant questionnaire. The data were recorded electronically through the "*Encuestas*" tool of the University of Murcia. Finally, once the event was over, the data were coded and analysed for the

writing of the final study. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Murcia (iD: 2491/2019).

### **Data analysis**

Data analysis was performed using the SPSS v.28.0 statistical software licensed by the University of Murcia. Descriptive statistics were calculated for quantitative variables (mean and standard deviation) and for qualitative variables (frequency and percentage). For the comparative analysis between groups, a Student's t-test was performed to analyse the differences between two groups, on the one hand, the difference between the gender of the respondents (male and female). For the comparative analysis between three groups, the ANOVA test was carried out to analyse the differences between the different categories competing in this CESA BM: infantile, cadet and youth. To analyse the difference between groups, the Tukey post hoc test was used. The significance level was set at a value of  $p \leq .05$ . Cohen's d effect size (cut-off points: 0.20 = small effect; 0.50 = medium effect; 0.80 = large effect) was estimated for continuous variables (Domínguez-Lara, 2018). Similarly  $\eta^2$ : partial eta squared: effect size 0.01 (small), 0.06 (medium), 0.14 (large) according to Cohen (1988);  $p < .05$ .

## **RESULTS**

### **Perceived quality of athletes**

Table 1 shows the data obtained from the questionnaires completed by the athletes who participated in CESA BM 22, from which information was obtained on the aspects mentioned above and which will be discussed below. The sub-dimension of "*Communication*" is made up of three items, the best perceived by the athletes being "*The organisation complies with the planned schedules*" ( $M = 4.48 \pm 0.72$ ). On the other hand, the worst rated item was "*The dissemination and promotion of the event*" ( $M = 4.05 \pm 0.82$ ).

The sub-dimension "*Staff interaction*", showed that the highest rated item was the friendliness of the existing staff to adequately attend the event ( $M = 4.60 \pm 0.63$ ); while the lowest rated item was the staff's willingness to help ( $M = 4.45 \pm 0.75$ ). Next, the sub-dimension that was posed to respondents was "*Logistical structure*". The worst rated of this sub-dimension was the item dealing with the attractiveness of the posters and visual aspects of the event ( $M = 4.09 \pm 0.84$ ).

To conclude the descriptive analysis of the Perceived Quality, the sub-dimension "*Complementary services*", composed of two items, will be mentioned. The best rated item mentioned the number of support services ( $M = 4.13 \pm 0.93$ ). On the other hand, the worst rated item was the number of services in the vicinity of the sports facility ( $M = 3.67 \pm 1.1$ ).

The next dimension to be analysed is General Quality, in which athletes were asked about variables such as the "*General quality of the service*" ( $M = 4.29 \pm 0.84$ ). This was followed by the sub-dimension "*Perceived value*", made up of a single item dealing with the comparison of this CESA with others ( $M = 3.44 \pm 1.16$ ). The next sub-dimension is "*Satisfaction*", being one of the best perceived, and related to the satisfaction of attending a CESA ( $M = 4.79 \pm 0.52$ ).

Concluding the descriptive analysis of this second dimension, we will mention the sub-dimension "*Future intentions*", composed of 2 items and being the best perceived by the athletes. The best rated item was the one that assessed the intentions to attend a CESA again ( $M = 4.87 \pm 0.42$ ). On the other hand, the least valued item was the item recommending the CESA to colleagues ( $M = 4.75 \pm 0.56$ ).

The last dimension of this survey is called “*Importance of performance*” and was composed of four items obtained from the work of Hyun and Jordan (2019). The most highly rated item was the item dealing with the importance of doing well for selection ( $M = 4.8 \pm 0.46$ ). In contrast, the lowest rated item was the satisfaction with one's own performance ( $M = 3.75 \pm 0.92$ ).

Table 1. Athletes' perceived quality.

	Average	Typical Dev.
<b>Perceived quality</b>		
<b>Communication</b>	4.25	0.6
CESA is well promoted and disseminated, providing sufficient practical information about it.	4.05	1.8
During the event, clear and precise information is given in order to know the development of the competition	4.21	0.8
The organisation is on schedule.	4.48	0.7
<b>Interaction</b>		
The organisation's staff is willing to help.	4.45	0.8
Volunteers are friendly and helpful.	4.60	0.6
<b>Logistic structure</b>		
The material elements used by the event are visually attractive (banners, hoardings, banners).	4.09	0.9
The results and the podium are visible to all spectators.	4.27	0.9
CESA 2022 has sufficient and adequate refreshment points.	4.1	0.9
<b>Complementary services</b>	3.96	0.8
CESA 2022 has sufficient support services (toilets, changing rooms, cloakroom, massage areas, stands, etc.).	4.13	0.9
Near the pavilion there are easily accessible shopping facilities (cafés, bars).	3.67	1.1
<b>General quality</b>		
<b>Services' general quality</b>	4.29	0.8
In general, the service offered by the organisation is adequate.	4.29	0.8
<b>Perceived value</b>	3.44	1.2
The quality of this CESA can be considered superior when compared to other CESAs.	3.44	1.2
<b>Satisfaction</b>	4.79	0.5
Overall, attending CESA is a satisfying experience.	4.79	0.5
<b>Future intentions</b>	4.8	0.4
I am willing to keep coming back for more editions of CESA.	4.87	0.4
I will recommend attending CESA to my friends and teammates.	4.75	0.6
<b>Importance of performance</b>		
It was important for me to get a good result with my team.	4.54	0.7
It was important for me to perform well for my team.	4.8	0.5
I am satisfied with the performance of my team at CESA 2022.	4.02	1
I am satisfied with my individual performance at CESA 2022.	3.75	0.92

A correlational analysis was made between all the sub-dimensions addressed in this questionnaire (Table 2). All variables were statistically, positively and significantly related to each other, highlighting the variables “*Communication*” and “*General quality of the event*”; and “*Communication*” and “*Complementary services*”, with moderate values of  $r = 0.620$  and  $r = 0.616$ , respectively. In contrast, the lowest relationships were found between the variable “*Perceived value*” and “*Future intentions*”, with an  $r = 0.178$ .

Table 2. Descriptive and correlation analysis of the factors.

Subdimension	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Communication	--							
2. Staff interaction	.509**	--						
3. Logistic elements	.504**	.431**	--					
4. Complementary services	.616**	.474**	.565**	--				
5. General quality	.620**	.531**	.490**	.635**	--			
6. Perceived value	.438**	.337**	.407**	.489**	.484**	--		
7. Satisfaction	.429**	.328**	.362**	.332**	.488**	.331**	--	
8. Future intentions	.370**	.256**	.274**	.286**	.385**	.178**	.554**	--

Note. \*\* The correlation is significant at the .01 level (bilateral).

### Perceived quality by gender

Next, we will look at the data obtained from a gender perspective (Table 3). In general, women had a better quality perception of the event than men. The best rated item for both genders was future intentions (Men =  $4.75 \pm 0.64$ ; Women:  $4.85 \pm 0.36$ ). On the other hand, the lowest rated item was one that dealt with the comparison of this CESA to others (Men =  $3.29 \pm 1.18$ ; Women:  $3.57 \pm 1.12$ ). It should be noted that statistically significant differences were found in all dimensions, except for the dimension dealing with the importance of performance.

Table 3. Perceived quality by gender-segregated sportsmen and women.

Subdimension	Male	Female	t	p-value	d-Cohen
	M (DT)	M (DT)			
Communication	4.15 (0.65)	4.33 (0.5)	-3.68	.001*	-0.325
Staff interaction	4.40 (0.73)	4.63 (0.49)	-4.21	.001*	-0.372
Logistic elements	4.04 (0.76)	4.30 (0.66)	-4.31	.001*	-0.381
Complementary services	3.83 (0.82)	4.08 (0.7)	-3.81	.001*	-0.337
General quality	4.10 (0.9)	4.45 (0.74)	-4.86	.001*	-0.429
Perceived value	3.29 (1.18)	3.57 (1.12)	-2.77	.006*	-0.245
Satisfaction	4.71 (0.61)	4.86 (0.4)	-3.20	.001*	-0.283
Future intentions	4.75 (0.64)	4.85 (0.36)	-2.75	.006*	-0.243
Importance of performance	4.61 (0.58)	4.69 (0.54)	-1.6	.110	-0.141

Note. \* $p < .05$ ; Cohen's d: Cohen's d; (0.20 = small effect; 0.50 = medium effect; 0.80 = large effect).

Table 4. Perceived quality according to competition category.

Subdimension	Competition category				F	Sig.	$\eta^2$
	Infantile	Cadet	Junior	Total			
	(n = 165)	(n = 175)	(n = 174)	(n = 514)			
	M (DT)	M (DT)	M (DT)	M (DT)			
Communication	4.43 (0.47)	4.15 (0.61)	4.16 (0.60)	4.25(0.58)	13.45	.00+ <sup>^</sup>	0.05
Staff interaction	4.67 (0.47)	4.39 (0.73)	4.53 (0.61)	4.53(0.63)	8.87	.00+	0.03
Logistic elements	4.31 (0.67)	4.11 (0.73)	4.12 (0.74)	4.18(0.72)	4.11	.02+ <sup>^</sup>	0.02
Complementary services	4.28 (0.66)	3.8 (0.78)	3.83 (0.78)	3.96(0.77)	21.93	.00+ <sup>^</sup>	0.08
General quality	4.61(0.58)	4.1 (0.88)	4.18 (0.91)	4.29(0.84)	19.40	.00+ <sup>^</sup>	0.07
Perceived value	3.92 (0.95)	3.44 (1.17)	2.99 (1.15)	3.44(1.16)	30.70	.00*	0.11
Satisfaction	4.93 (0.28)	4.78 (0.53)	4.67 (0.63)	4.79(0.52)	11.20	.00+ <sup>^</sup>	0.04
Future intentions	4.91 (0.25)	4.78 (0.41)	4.74 (0.51)	4.81(0.41)	8.44	.00+ <sup>^</sup>	0.03
Importance of performance	4.82 (0.46)	4.58 (0.54)	4.57 (0.62)	4.65(0.56)	11.56	.00+ <sup>^</sup>	0.04

Note: \*Significant differences between all groups (infants - cadets - juniors); + Significant differences between infants and cadets; <sup>^</sup> Significant differences between infants and juniors; <sup>^</sup> Significant differences between cadets and juniors;  $p < .05$ .

### **Perceived quality according to competition**

The next comparative analysis to be carried out will compare the differences in perception that occurred depending on the category in which each athlete competed (Table 4). As can be seen, the athletes competing in the children's category were the ones who best perceived the quality of the event in general, while the cadet and junior athletes exchanged ratings. The sub-dimension best rated by the child athletes was "Satisfaction" ( $M = 4.93 \pm 0.28$ ); while the cadet and junior athletes perceived the sub-dimension "Future intentions" best (Cadets =  $4.78 \pm 0.41$ ; Juniors =  $4.74 \pm 0.51$ ). However, all three categories perceived "Perceived value" as the worst subdimension (Infantile =  $3.92 \pm 0.95$ ; Cadets =  $3.44 \pm 1.17$  and Juniors =  $2.99 \pm 1.15$ ). It should be noted that statistically significant differences were found between the different groups.

## **DISCUSSION**

By reviewing the current scientific literature and making a comparative work, we found that the results obtained in relation to the quality perceived by athletes are similar to what can be read in prestigious scientific articles. It is important to highlight which were the best perceived variables, being "Future intentions" and "Satisfaction", this result is understood since these championships is a unique experience for players in training category to experience high level sport with experiences of professional sport; in the same way it can be seen in the scientific literature, when the perceptions of quality and satisfaction are high the intentions to return to participate in future editions increase (Magaz-González et al. 2021; Milovanovic et al. 2021).

Similarly, it would be interesting to note that, as with spectators, "Staff interaction" is highly valued, including their willingness to help and friendliness; in the scientific literature there are studies that support these results, such as those of Angosto (2016b), Ramos et al (2021) or Madruga-Vicente (2021). In terms of the worst-perceived variables in this questionnaire, "Complementary services" is mentioned, not having a direct relationship with the management of the event, but rather with the location of the pavilions where the events were organised and the scarcity of services in the vicinity. It is also worth mentioning that this is usually a variable that is highlighted negatively, as can be seen in the results obtained in Ramos et al (2021) and Madruga-Vicente (2021) and should serve to improve these aspects of the organisation of sporting events. To conclude, it should be noted that the worst rated sub-dimension was "value", which mentioned the comparison with previous editions.

In the following, we will discuss some of the results obtained by differentiating the participating athletes by gender, with the aim of verifying the different ways in which athletes perceive a service depending on their gender. It is remarkable to say that statistically significant differences were found in all sub-dimensions, except "Importance of performance". Also, as explained above, the results indicate that women have a higher perception of quality. It will be said that the sub-dimension most highly rated by both female and male players are "satisfaction" and "future intentions", followed by "personal interaction". However, the worst rated sub-dimension was "value" and, for both sexes, the comparison of this edition with previous editions made them perceive that this CESA did not bring them as much as other past experiences.

Finally, we will analyse some of the results obtained by segmenting them by competition categories (Infantile, Cadet and Youth), with the aim of checking the different ways in which athletes perceive a service depending on the category in which they play. As can be seen, in general terms, the category that best perceived the quality of the organization of the event were the players in the infantile category, with the subdimension "satisfaction" and "future intentions" being the best valued, and statistically significant differences were also found between infantile, cadet and juvenile; followed by "personal interaction", in which significant differences

were only found between infantile and cadet. If we look at the two remaining categories, it can be seen that they perceive quality in a similar way, but intermittently in their evaluations. The sub-dimensions of "Communication", "Staff interaction", "Logistic elements" and "Complementary services" were perceived with higher quality by cadets; while juniors perceived the sub-dimensions of "Overall quality of the event", "Perceived value" better, this being the only sub-dimension where statistically significant differences were found between all groups, "Satisfaction", "Future intentions" and "Importance of the performance". This could be justified by explaining the number of experiences a youth player has had, having participated in a greater number of CESAS and being able to make a more critical analysis of this experience.

## **CONCLUSION**

Once the results have been presented and confronted with the existing scientific literature, some of the conclusions obtained from the two sample groups and the contributions of this study in the field of sport management and perceived quality will be mentioned.

The main conclusions obtained from the specific objectives set out in this study are:

1. The dimension of perceived quality with the highest score is the intention to continue attending future editions and the satisfaction of attending this type of events. The sportsmen and women value very positively the intention to recommend the event to their friends or third parties.
2. The results of participants according to gender show higher scores for women than for men. Statistically significant differences were found in the comparison between athletes.
3. The results of the perceived quality according to the competition category of the athletes indicate that children's players perceive the quality of the event significantly better than cadets and youth athletes.
4. Good individual performance is more highly valued by the athletes than good collective performance.

## **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

Liam Cano-Coyle, José Miguel Vegara-Ferri, and José María López-Gullón, conceived and designed the investigation, collected data, analysed and interpreted the data, drafted the manuscript, and approved the final version submitted.

## **SUPPORTING AGENCIES**

No funding agencies were reported by the authors.

## **DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The researcher would like to thank the Spanish and Murcia Handball Federations for providing the opportunity to collect data so that this article can be completed properly and can be used by sport managers and event organizers.



**REFERENCES**

- Afthinos, Y., Theodorakis, N. D., y Nassis, P. (2005). Customers' expectations of service in Greek fitness centers: Gender, age, type of sport center, and motivation differences. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 15(3), 245-258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520510597809>
- Angosto-Sánchez, S., López-Gullón, J.M., Díaz-Suárez, A. (2016a). Una escala para la evaluación de la calidad percibida por participantes en eventos deportivos populares (CAPPEP V2.0). *Journal of Sports Economics & Management*, 6(2), 69-84.
- Angosto-Sánchez, S., López-Gullón, J.M., Díaz-Suárez, A. (2016b). La calidad percibida por los participantes en dos ediciones de una carrera popular. *Intangible Capital*, 12(3), 789- 804. <https://doi.org/10.3926/ic.782>
- Ballesteros, I. G. (2019). Evaluación de la calidad percibida de los atletas participantes en un medio maratón internacional. *EmásF: revista digital de educación física*, (60), 76-90.
- Bitner, M.J.; Hubbert, A. (1994): "Encounter satisfaction versus overall satisfaction versus quality". *Service Quality*, Eds. Rust and Oliver, Sage Publication, pp. 72-94. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452229102.n3>
- Calabuig, F.; Burillo, P.; Crespo, J.; Mundina, J.J. y Gallardo, L. (2010). Satisfacción, calidad y valor percibido en espectadores de atletismo. *Revista Internacional de Medicina y Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte* vol. 10 (40) pp. 577-593. Retrieved from [Accessed 2024, 04 September]: <http://cdeporte.rediris.es/revista/revista40/artsatisfaccion182.htm>
- Chelladurai, P., & Chang, K. (2000). Targets and standards of quality in sport services. *Sport management review*, 3(1), 1-22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523\(00\)70077-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(00)70077-5)
- Gálvez, P. y Morales Sánchez, V. (2011). Evaluación de la calidad en programas municipales deportivos: generalizabilidad y optimización de diseños de medida.
- Llorens, F. J., & Fuentes, M. M. (2000). *Calidad total. Fundamentos e implantación*. Madrid: Pirámide.
- Madrugá-Vicente, M., Cerro-Herrero, D., Angosto-Sánchez, S., & Prieto-Prieto, J. (2021). Calidad percibida e intenciones futuras en eventos deportivos: segmentación de participantes de carreras por montaña. *Cultura, Ciencia y Deporte*, 16(50), 605-615. <https://doi.org/10.12800/ccd.v16i50.1584>
- Magaz-González, A.M. y Fanjul-Suárez, J.L. (2021). Organización de eventos deportivos y gestión de proyectos: factores, fases y áreas. *Revista Internacional de Medicina y Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte* vol. 12 (45) pp. 138-169. Retrieved from [Accessed 2024, 04 September]: <http://cdeporte.rediris.es/revista/revista45/artorganizacion209.htm>
- Milovanović, I., Matić, R., Alexandris, K., Maksimović, N., Milošević, Z., & Drid, P. (2021). Destination image, sport event quality, and behavioral intentions: The cases of three World Sambo Championships. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 45(7), 1150-1169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348019883920>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. y Berry, L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49, 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298504900403>
- Ramos, J. R., Herrero, D. C., Vicente, M. M., & Prieto, J. P. (2021). Evaluación de eventos deportivos: el caso del campeonato de España de descenso de cañones 2019. *riccafd: Revista Iberoamericana de Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte*, 10(2), 60-78. <https://doi.org/10.24310/riccafd.2021.v10i2.12049>
- Tsitskari, E., Tsiotras, D., & Tsiotras, G. (2006). Measuring service quality in sport services. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 17(5), 623-631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360600588190>
- Vegara Ferri, J. M., Carboneros, M., & Angosto, S. (2021). Perception of quality, socio-cultural impact, destination image and future intentions of the tourist participating in a sustainable nautical event. *Cultura\_Ciencia\_Deporte [CCD]*, 16(50). <https://doi.org/10.30827/publicaciones.v50i1.15992>

Vicente, M. M., Herrero, D. C., Sánchez, S. A., & Prieto, J. P. (2021). Calidad percibida e intenciones futuras en eventos deportivos: segmentación de participantes de carreras por montaña. *Cultura, ciencia y deporte*, 16(50). <https://doi.org/10.12800/ccd.v16i50.1584>

Zeithalm, V. (1988): "Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence", *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 52, July, pp.2-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200302>

