



Progress in Tourism Management

Progress in sports tourism research? A meta-review and exploration of futures

Mike Weed^{*,1}*Centre for Sport, Physical Education & Activity Research (SPEAR), Canterbury Christ Church University, North Holmes Campus, Canterbury, Kent CT1 1QU, UK*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 30 November 2008

Accepted 9 February 2009

Keywords:

Sports tourism

Meta-review

Theory

Method

ABSTRACT

This meta-review examines the journeys that previous reviewers of the field of sports tourism have taken over the sports tourism research terrain. The contested nature of core concepts (terminology, categories and the nature of the phenomena), dominant research areas (event sports tourism, a trend from impacts to leveraging research, often poor quality behavioural research, destination marketing and media, and resident perceptions), and the extent to which research is underpinned by, or rooted in, various subjects and/or disciplines, are all discussed. Various futures envisaged by previous reviewers are identified; in particular: management futures, knowledge futures, futures of the nature of sports tourism, and critical and challenging futures. In conclusion, it is suggested that a clear indicator of the maturity of sports tourism as a field of study would be a 'comfortableness' with the existence of contested perspectives and ideas, and a reflexive appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of research in the field, particularly in response to external challenges and critiques.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

There is a temptation, perhaps even a tradition, when writing reviews of research progress in particular fields of study, to present an analysis or synthesis that is almost epiphanic in nature. The tradition is to discuss research to date and to arrive at a conclusion that research in the area has reached a turning point, or a stage of maturity, that (amazingly fortuitously) co-incides exactly with the time of writing of the review. And to propose that, thanks to the epiphany facilitated by the review, from this point or stage the future research needs or directions for the field are now clear. The reviewer's job is done, the review itself is justified, and the field can now make significant progress as its future direction has been clearly laid out.

Such "epiphanic reviews" are assisted by the tendency to reify fields of knowledge, using expressions like "what the field needs" or "the field has attempted to define". Committing the 'pathetic fallacy' of endowing a field with human emotions and with the capability of agency renders more acceptable the suggestion of the arrival of the field at an epiphanic point where it 'realizes' what it needs to do to successfully develop in the future.

Of course, the problem here, other than the philosophical one, is that representing a reified field as having an epiphany from which the future is clear assumes (in fact requires) that there is a singular view of past, present and future research activity, and that the reviewer is simply collating and presenting such research in a way that allows the epiphany to take place. Such reviews also invite the collusion of others in a singular view by utilising a collective first person narrative suggesting, for example, that "we have witnessed the rapid recent development of our field".

In contrast to the epiphanic approach, this review of research relating to the relationship between sport and tourism presents neither an epiphany, nor invites collusion in the discussions. In fact, past, present and potential future research is presented as a contested terrain over which a range of previous reviewers have taken different routes from different origins to arrive at different points in the present, and from which they have seen different routes into the future. That the journeys presented by previous reviewers are so different is a function of, at various points in time: a lack of coherence in research relating to sports tourism; a lack of agreement about fundamental concepts and assumptions about the nature of the relationship between sport and tourism; the range of perspectives of (or taken by) reviewers; the aims and objectives of the reviews; and the nature of the processes of reviewing and/or synthesising research itself. To avoid this paper becoming simply another story of another journey through research, it will attempt a slightly different task, namely a 'meta-review'. A meta-review is, quite simply, a review of reviews (c.f., [Heal, 2008](#); [Ruddy & House, 2005](#); [Serenko & Bontis, 2004](#)). In this case it will involve an examination of the journeys previous reviews have taken through

* Tel.: +44 1227 782743.

E-mail address: mike.weed@canterbury.ac.uk

¹ Mike Weed is Professor of Sport in Society, Director of the Centre for Sport, Physical Education & Activity Research (SPEAR) and Faculty Research Director for the Faculty of Social & Applied Sciences at Canterbury Christ Church University. He is Editor of the Journal of Sport & Tourism and his substantive research interests lie in all aspects of the relationship between sport and tourism. Methodologically, he is interested in the development and application of methods of research synthesis, in the epistemology of qualitative research and in grounded theory.

research in the field, and an interrogation of the explicit and implicit decisions made by reviewers in conducting the reviews. In this way it can explore the way in which, for example, conscious or unconscious decisions about what research and perspectives have been covered by the review have affected the journey the reviewer has taken across the research terrain. As most reviews make some comment on potential future research, this paper will also explore the research futures suggested. In taking such an approach, the aim is to present an historiographic and contemporaneous analysis of “progress in sports tourism”.

1. Reviewing sports tourism research

Many reviews of the relationship between sport and tourism commence with a comment on the respective sizes of the sport and tourism industries and/or on the increasing convergence of sport and tourism in the practice of providers and participants. Some also comment on the growth of research and publications. In introducing the reviews included in this meta-review, some similar comments are inevitable in explaining the time-span covered. It appears that the first publication relating to sports tourism was published by the Central Council for Physical Recreation in 1966. Entitled simply “Sport and Tourism”, it was written by Don Anthony and offered some comments on the role sport might play in holiday tourism (Anthony, 1966). In the twenty years following that publication, other commentaries on the way in which sport and tourism might relate to each other have appeared sporadically. In 1970, Williams and Zelinsky highlighted the tourism generation potential of mega-sports events such as the Olympic Games (Williams & Zelinsky, 1970), a theme that continues to the present day (see, for example, Weed, 2008b). In fact, event sports tourism, as well as being a significant manifestation of the relationship between sport and tourism, overlaps with another important field of enquiry, that of event tourism, which was recently the subject of a similar “progress” review in this journal (Getz, 2008). Later in the 1970s the winter sports market in Scotland was noted as an important tourism market niche by Baker and Gordon (1976) and, of course, skiing and other winter sports are amongst the longest standing sports tourism products (see Hudson, 2000). In 1982, Glyptis examined sport and tourism in five European countries and compared these to the UK. Five demand categories were identified and suggestions for policy made. Other studies throughout 1980s tended to focus on the benefits of staging major events along the lines of the Olympic or Commonwealth Games or World Championships in the major sports such as Football and Athletics (Armstrong, 1985; Kolsun, 1988; Lazer, 1985; Livesey, 1990; Ritchie, 1984). These works emphasised the economic effect of the immediate and post-event tourism such events generate. There was also a focus in 1980s on the potential of both sport and tourism to assist in the regeneration of declining economies through the stimulation of social and industrial development (Beioley, Crookston, & Tyrer, 1988; McDowell, Leslie, & Callicot, 1988). However, whilst the period to 1990 had produced a number of studies relevant to understanding the nature of the relationship between sport and tourism, few studies existed that were *about* the relationship between sport and tourism. For this reason, there were no real reviews of the field before 1990, as there was simply not enough research to review. However, in the 18 years since 1990, there have been 18 reports, articles, book chapters or books that in one way or another might be considered reviews of the field, and it is these that comprise the source material for this meta-review.

Table 1 lists the 18 reviews in chronological order, together with their key features, and a descriptive overview of these works is perhaps useful before commencing a more detailed analysis.

The reviews comprise seven introductory overviews, four market reviews, four narrative literature reviews, one narrative discussion, one systematic review of literature, and an edited reader of research papers. Not surprisingly, the introductory overviews (which span the full period covered by this meta-review) are all chapters in edited books which are largely intended as student introductions. The books themselves vary from focussing on social aspects (e.g. Jackson & Weed, 2003, in Houlihan, “Sport in Society”), through management or business (e.g. Gibson, 2003, in Parks & Quarterman, “Contemporary Sport Management”; Weed, 2005a, in Beech & Chadwick, “The Business of Tourism Management”), to a more specialist focus on niche markets (e.g. Hall, 1992, in Hall & Weiler, “Special Interest Tourism”), and this has obviously affected the content of the reviews. Earlier in the period covered, the reviews were based on the ways in which sport and tourism *might* inter-relate, with a greater focus on *how* they inter-relate in more recent chapters, although some of the earlier works did suggest concepts and approaches that have regularly featured or been adapted in the literature since. The same might be said of the four market reviews, each of which was conducted in the first eight years of the 18 years covered by this meta-review. Like the early introductory overviews, these market reviews suggested ways in which sport and tourism *might* be linked for mutual benefit. However, they often differed from the introductory overviews in that they focussed on market structure, using anecdotal or illustrative examples of interaction between sport and tourism to suggest potential avenues for future linkage. One of these market reviews was a book chapter, another a report for a policy agency, with two being published in refereed journals. It is an indication of the embryonic nature of research in the field in these early years that such descriptive market reviews were publishable as refereed journal articles at the time, and an indication of the growth of research in the field since that they would not be acceptable to refereed journals today. In fact, in the year after the last of the market reviews was published, Weed (1999) labelled such reviews as “advocacy” (seeking to establish recognition of a potential relationship between sport and tourism), and noted that such work, while useful in the early years of the development of research in the field, was perhaps no longer appropriate and suggested that research on sports tourism might turn to providing evidence for the nature and extent of the link, and to examining policy responses.

The four narrative literature reviews, which broadly span the middle years of the period covered, focussed much more clearly on the research literature as the source material for discussing the link between sport and tourism. Indicative of the growth of research in the field, it is instructive that Jackson and Glyptis’ (1992) review largely extrapolated issues *relevant* to sports tourism from more general literature on sport, tourism, leisure and regeneration, whilst the later reviews (Gibson, 1998, 2002; Weed, 1999) were able to draw on source material that had been written *about* sports tourism. These four reviews comprised a commissioned report for a national agency, a refereed journal article and two published conference keynote addresses, and it may well be the case that the appearance of the latter three of these reviews in the public domain at the turn of the century sparked a realisation among researchers working in the field that the descriptive market reviews published in the preceding years were now obsolete given the wider availability of research evidence.

In 2001, the World Tourism Organisation and the International Olympic Committee held a joint conference to discuss the relationship between sport and tourism. To support the event, the WTO and IOC jointly commissioned an “introductory report” to the conference (Keller, 2001). However, somewhat frustratingly, this report drew on virtually none of the previous research evidence that Gibson (1998) and Weed (1999) had identified three and two

متن کامل مقاله

دریافت فوری ←

ISIArticles

مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران

- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
- ✓ پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
- ✓ امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
- ✓ امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
- ✓ امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
- ✓ دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
- ✓ پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات