



JOURNAL OF EVENT, TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY STUDIES

<https://e-journal.uum.edu.my/index.php/jeth>

How to cite this article:

Sharif, N. M., Shukor, S. A., Alwi, M. K., & Nazari, N. M. (2025) Relationships Among Event Quality, Athlete Satisfaction and Future Participation in University Sports Events. *Journal of Event, Tourism and Hospitality Studies*, 5, 145 - 164. <https://doi.org/10.32890/jeth2025.5.9>

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG EVENT QUALITY, ATHLETE SATISFACTION AND FUTURE PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY SPORTS EVENTS

¹Norhafiza Md Sharif, ²Suryati Abd Shukor, ³Mohamad Khairi Alwi & ⁴Norwani Mohd Nazari⁴

*^{1,2,3&4}School of Tourism, Hospitality and Event Management,
Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia*

¹Corresponding author: norhafiza.md.sharif@uum.edu.my

Received: 9/5/2025

Revised: 15/7/2025

Accepted: 30/7/2025

Published: 31/7/2025

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the influence of event quality specifically facilities and support services on athletes' satisfaction and future participation to the event during the SUKIPT 2024 sports event hosted at Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM). The primary objective is to evaluate how these elements of event quality affect athlete experiences and their intention for future participation to the event. Using a quantitative research design, data were collected through purposive sampling via a structured questionnaire administered to 233 athletes who directly engaged with the event's facilities and services. Statistical analyses, including regression and correlation, were conducted using SPSS Version 30. Results reveal that both facilities ($\beta = 0.662$, $p < 0.001$) and support services ($\beta = 0.216$, $p = 0.021$) significantly predict athlete satisfaction, explaining 75.4% of the variance. Moreover, a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.929$, $p < 0.001$) was found between athlete satisfaction and future participation to the event, highlighting that improved event quality can substantially enhance athletes' loyalty and willingness to return. This study makes a meaningful contribution to sports event management by empirically validating the link between event quality dimensions and athlete outcomes in a university sports context. The findings offer actionable recommendations for event organizers to improve facilities, logistics and service delivery ultimately supporting the sustainability and success of inter-university sports events in Malaysia.

Keywords: Event quality, athlete satisfaction, facilities, support services, sports event management.

INTRODUCTION

Sports events serve as pivotal platforms for athletic performance, community engagement and the promotion of healthy lifestyles. The quality of these events significantly influences athletes' experiences and satisfaction levels, which in turn affect their future participation and the overall success of the events (Lianopoulos et al., 2024). Event quality encompasses various dimensions, including facilities, support services and organizational aspects, all contributing to the athletes' perceptions and satisfaction (Matić et al., 2024). High-quality event management not only enhances the experience of participants but also strengthens the reputation and sustainability of sports events (Yoshida & James, 2010). Facilities provided, as a core component of event quality, play a crucial role in shaping athletes' experiences. Adequate and well-maintained facilities not only ensure the safety and performance efficiency of athletes but also enhance their overall satisfaction (Setyaningtyas, et al, 2021). Specifically, facilities such as training grounds, competition venues, seating arrangements and venue accessibility contribute to athletes' comfort and performance capabilities (Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008). When facilities meet or exceed expectations, athletes are more likely to express higher satisfaction and engage positively with the event (Papadimitriou & Karteroliotis, 2000).

Similarly, support services are integral to the seamless execution of sports events. These services include medical assistance, logistical arrangements, communication channels and security measures that directly impact athletes' comfort and satisfaction (Mohd Aznan et al., 2024). Efficient support services ensure that athletes' needs are met promptly and effectively, reducing uncertainties and enhancing their overall experience (Kim & Kim, 2020). In addition, Micklema (2024) underscores that streamlined logistics including transport coordination and emergency preparedness to reduce operational stress and contribute to a seamless event environment. Kozanecka (2025) further argues that clear and timely communication among organizers, participants, and stakeholders is foundational to professional execution and positive attendee impressions. These operational elements not only mitigate risks but also enhance athletes' trust in event organizers, thereby increasing their likelihood of future participation. Collectively, the literature suggests that investing in logistical excellence and communication infrastructure is not merely a technical necessity but a strategic imperative for sustainable event success.

Recent studies have underscored the significance of event quality in influencing athletes' future participations. A study on the World Wrestling Championship highlighted that high-quality event organization positively affected athletes' satisfaction and their intention to participate in future events (Matić et al., 2024). These findings emphasize that investments in event quality not only improve immediate participant experiences but also build long-term loyalty and engagement (Lianopoulos et al., 2024). For this research, Sukan Institusi Pendidikan Tinggi (SUKIPT), or the Higher Education Institution Sports Tournament, is a flagship biennial multi-sport event organized under the auspices of the Ministry of Higher Education (Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi, 2023). Since its inception in 2012, SUKIPT has served as a premier inter-varsity sports competition aimed at fostering sports excellence, national integration and holistic student development among Malaysia's public and private higher education institutions. SUKIPT functions as a vital platform for identifying emerging sports talent, developing competitive spirit among students and strengthening the sports ecosystem within tertiary education. Over the years, it has grown both in scale and prominence, playing a critical role in aligning the goals of university-level sports with national sports development agendas. The 2024 edition of SUKIPT, held from 6 to 14 September 2024, marked the

sixth iteration of the event and was hosted by Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM). This edition featured 28 competitive sports, offering 233 gold medals and attracted 74 contingents representing a wide range of public and private universities across Malaysia. The scale of participation reflects not only the event's competitive intensity but also the logistical complexity and management requirements of hosting a large-scale, multi-day sports tournament. SUKIPT 2024 also underscored KPT's commitment to elevating the status of sports in higher education and promoting student-athlete engagement.

Despite its importance, empirical studies examining the impact of event quality particularly facilities and support services on athletes' satisfaction in SUKIPT remain limited. Addressing this gap is essential for enhancing the event's overall management and sustainability, which in turn can strengthen its reputation as a premier university-level sports event in Malaysia. The primary objective of this study is to examine the influence of event quality specifically facilities and support services on athletes' satisfaction and future participation during the SUKIPT event at UUM. The study aims to assess how key facility components, such as sports equipment, seating arrangements and venue accessibility, impact athletes' satisfaction levels. It also investigates the contribution of support services, including logistical coordination, communication efficiency and security provisions, to the overall athlete experience. Understanding these dimensions is crucial for event organizers to enhance service delivery, improve participant satisfaction and foster sustained athlete engagement. By achieving these aims, the study seeks to offer practical recommendations for improving the quality of sports events, promoting repeat participation and supporting the strategic advancement of inter-university sports event management in Malaysia.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The quality of sports events significantly influences athletes' experiences and satisfaction, which directly impacts their future participation to events. While previous studies have emphasized the importance of event quality in enhancing athlete experiences (Kim & Kim, 2020; Lianopoulos et al., 2024), many large-scale university competitions still face challenges in meeting athletes' expectations. These challenges often stem from inadequate facilities, insufficient support services and poor logistical management, which negatively affect the overall event quality and reduce athletes' satisfaction. Research has established that event quality involves various components, such as physical facilities, support services and event organization (Matić et al., 2024; Lianopoulos et al., 2024). Past study has shown that poorly maintained facilities, such as inadequate seating, limited accessibility and substandard sports equipment, are common sources of dissatisfaction among athletes (Rozman Azram et al., 2023). Furthermore, deficiencies in support services, including medical assistance, timely transportation and effective communication, undermine athletes' comfort and safety, further lowering their satisfaction (Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008; Mohd Aznan et al., 2024). For instance, delays or inadequacies in support services often result in negative perceptions of event quality (Matić et al., 2024).

In the case of SUKIPT at UUM, there is a lack of empirical research specifically investigating how the quality of facilities and support services provided influences athletes' satisfaction. While previous research on sports event quality has mainly focused on professional and international events (Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008; Wu et al., 2022), limited studies have examined these aspects in the context of inter-university events like SUKIPT. Therefore, there is a gap in understanding how various elements of event quality, such as

facilities, support services, and event organization, affect athletes' perceptions and satisfaction during this specific event. Addressing this gap is critical for the enhancement and sustainability of sports events. By improving event quality, organizers can increase athlete satisfaction and encourage future participation to event. Ensuring the prioritization of high-quality facilities and efficient support services is essential not only for improving the participant experience but also for fostering continued engagement in SUKIPT and similar events. Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the influence of event quality specifically facilities and support services on athletes' satisfaction and their future participation to sport events, with a focus on the SUKIPT event held at UUM.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Event quality is a critical factor that shapes athletes' satisfaction and their likelihood of returning to future sports events. In university-hosted sports events such as the Sukan Institusi Pendidikan Tinggi (SUKIPT) at Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), understanding the various elements of event quality is essential to enhancing athlete experiences and ensuring the long-term success of these events. This literature review examines the impact of event quality, including facilities, support services and overall event organization, on athlete satisfaction and future participations. The review draws on recent studies to better understand the link between event quality and athlete loyalty.

Event Quality and Athlete Satisfaction

Event quality consists of multiple dimensions that contribute to the overall experience of participants. These dimensions include tangible aspects like facilities and services, as well as intangible factors such as event atmosphere and organization (Asmawi et al., 2024). Previous research indicates that event quality has a significant influence on athlete satisfaction, which, in turn, impacts their intention to return (Shonk, 2008; Liu et al., 2024). Asmawi et al. (2024) highlight that service quality in stadium environments, encompassing tangibles, reliability and empathy, directly affects customer satisfaction, suggesting the same might be true in the context of sports events. Aznan et al. (2024) further emphasize that university students' motivation to engage with sports facilities is highly influenced by service quality. Their study found a direct link between improved service quality and increased satisfaction and engagement, demonstrating that enhancing event facilities and services leads to better athlete satisfaction. Additionally, venue quality and accessibility have been identified as key determinants of satisfaction in sports tourism (Shonk, 2008; Liu et al., 2024).

Support Services and Athlete Satisfaction

Support services, such as medical assistance, transportation and accommodation, are integral components of event quality that significantly affect athlete satisfaction. According to Currie et al. (2021), comprehensive medical preparedness is essential for ensuring athlete safety, enhancing their confidence in event management. Their guidelines on healthcare services at sporting events stress the importance of pre-event planning, the availability of on-site medical support and emergency preparedness to ensure a positive athlete experience. The logistical aspects of sports events, including accommodation distance and ease of access to venues, are also crucial for athlete satisfaction. Yusof et al. (2022) found that dissatisfaction with the distance between accommodation and sports venues negatively impacted athlete satisfaction. These

findings underline the importance of efficient logistical planning to minimize dissatisfaction and enhance the overall experience of participants.

Future Participations to Event

Athlete satisfaction is strongly correlated with the intention to return to future events. Liu et al. (2015) explored the relationship between event quality and athletes' future participations in the context of road running events. Their research revealed that positive perceptions of event quality particularly in terms of facilities, services and organizational aspects led to higher levels of satisfaction, which, in turn, increased the likelihood of athletes returning to future events. Additionally, Matić et al. (2024) conducted a study on the influence of sports event quality on future participations during the implementation of COVID-19 safety measures. Their findings indicate that higher event quality leads to greater athlete satisfaction and more favorable future participations, including future participations. This further supports the notion that event quality plays a pivotal role in fostering athlete loyalty and long-term participation.

Research by Disegna and Osti (2012) examined the effect of loyalty and tourist satisfaction with a sporting event on visitors' future participation to revisit and recommend the event as well as its nearby tourist destinations. Their study found that satisfaction with services, pricing and accessibility significantly influenced repeat visits and recommendations, reinforcing the importance of event quality in shaping athlete loyalty. Furthermore, Karagiorgos et al. (2020) investigated the influence of destination image and event quality on athletes' intentions to revisit the host city. Their study, conducted on the 2017 World Youth and Juniors' Sambo Championships, found that event quality measured through core services, tangibles and supporting aspects had a direct impact on athletes' future participations, including word-of-mouth recommendations and future participation. A study by Setyaningtyas (2021) explored the relationship between destination image, sports involvement, event quality and travel motives as antecedent factors influencing future participation in recurring running sports events. The findings suggest that event quality plays a crucial role in shaping athletes' perceptions and their likelihood of returning to similar events.

These studies collectively highlight the importance of event quality in fostering athlete satisfaction, loyalty and future participations. By ensuring high-quality facilities, well-organized logistics and strong support services, event organizers can enhance athlete experiences and encourage long-term participation.

METHODOLOGY

The research methodology for this study is structured to investigate the influence of event quality on athletes' satisfaction and their future participation to sports events, with a specific focus on the SUKIPT hosted at UUM. This section outlines the research design, sampling strategy, data collection methods and analytical techniques employed to address the study's objectives. Each component is systematically aligned to assess how event facilities and support services impact athletes' overall experiences and their likelihood of future participation.

Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative research design to enable the systematic collection and analysis of numerical data aimed at identifying relationships between event quality, athletes' satisfaction and their future participation to sports events. A survey method is employed, with data gathered at a single point during the SUKIPT event held at UUM. This design is particularly suitable for capturing athletes' immediate perceptions and experiences related to dimensions of event quality namely facilities and support services, while also assessing how these factors influence their overall satisfaction and likelihood of future participation.

Population and Sampling

The study focuses on athletes who participated in the sixth edition of SUKIPT 2024, held at UUM from September 6–14, involving 74 contingents from Malaysian higher education institutions across diverse sports disciplines. The population thus includes athletes with varied experience and competitive exposure. Purposive sampling was used to select participants with direct involvement in SUKIPT's facilities, support services and organization are key areas for assessing event quality, satisfaction and future participation. As noted by Palinkas et al. (2015), this approach ensures the inclusion of respondents with informed insights, while Creswell and Creswell (2018) emphasize its suitability in studies seeking experience-based responses.

A total of 233 athletes were selected, with the sample size guided by Cochran's (1977) recommendations for correlational and regression analyses. This number allows for adequate representation and generalizability. Similar sample sizes in past sports event studies (Theodorakis et al., 2013; Yoshida & James, 2010) have proven effective in generating valid results. The justification of choosing purposive sampling lies in its ability to enhance the credibility and relevance of the study by selecting participants who have had direct and meaningful engagement with the event quality dimensions of SUKIPT. By focusing on athletes who actively experienced the facilities, support services and organizational aspects of the event, the study ensures that the data collected are rich, relevant and reflective of actual perceptions. This method minimizes the inclusion of uninformed responses and enhances data accuracy the likelihood of bias from uninformed responses and allows for a more accurate assessment of how event quality influences satisfaction and future participations.

Data Analysis Techniques

The collected data will be analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 30. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and frequency distributions will be used to summarize demographic information and athletes' responses. Inferential statistics, including regression and correlation analyses. Regression analysis will be employed to investigate the relationship between event quality specifically the dimensions of facilities and support services and athletes' satisfaction. In addition, correlation analysis will be conducted to explore the relationship between athletes' satisfaction with event quality and their future participation to participate in future sports events.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 1 demonstrates the demographic profile of the respondent. The finding shows a relatively balanced gender distribution, with males comprising 55.4% (n=129) and females 44.6% (n=104). Most participants were aged between 18–22 years (45.9%, n=107), followed by those aged 21–23 (40.8%, n=95), reflecting the typical university age range. In terms of religion, 55.4% (n=129) identified as Muslim, 40.3% (n=94) as Buddhist, with smaller representations of Christians (2.6%, n=6), Hindus (0.9%, n=2) and others (0.9%, n=2). Ethnically, the majority were Malay (53.6%, n=125), followed by Chinese (43.3%, n=101) and smaller percentages from Indian and other ethnic groups. Most respondents were Malaysian (97.9%, n=228), with only 2.1% (n=5) being non-Malaysian. Undergraduates made up 96.1% (n=224) of the sample, while 3.9% (n=9) were postgraduates and majority were full-time students (98.3%, n=229). Regarding year of study, students were fairly distributed: Year 2 (31.3%, n=73), Year 3 (24.5%, n=57), Year 1 (24.0%, n=56), Year 4 (15.9%, n=37) and Year 5 (4.3%, n=10). These findings reflect the inclusive and diverse nature of athlete participation in SUKIPT across various academic and demographic backgrounds.

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic Profile	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	104	44.6
	Male	129	55.4
	Total	233	100
Age	18 – 22 years old	107	45.9
	21 – 23 years old	95	40.8
	24 – 26 years old	26	11.2
	27 and older	5	2.1
	Total	233	100
Religion	Buddha	94	40.3
	Christian	6	2.6
	Hindu	2	0.9
	Islam	129	55.4
	Others	2	0.9
	Total	233	100
Race	Bajau	1	0.4
	Bumiputera Sabah	1	0.4
	Chinese	101	43.3
	Indian	3	1.3
	Malay	125	53.6
	Punjabi	1	0.4
	Total	233	100

Nationality	Malaysian	228	97.9
	Non-Malaysian	5	2.1
	Total	233	100
Level of Study	Postgraduate	9	3.9
	Undergraduate	224	96.1
	Total	233	100
Mode of Study	Full-time	229	98.3
	Part-time	4	1.7
	Total	233	100
Year of Study	Year 1	56	24.0
	Year 2	73	31.3
	Year 3	57	24.5
	Year 4	37	15.9
	Year 5	10	4.3
	Total	233	100

Institutional Representation (Contingent/IPT)

In the overview of institutional representation in SUKIPT UUM 2024, UUM, as the host, had the highest athlete participation at 25.3% (n=59) (Table 2). Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) followed with 5.6% (n=13), while Universiti Malaysia Pahang (UMP) contributed 4.7% (n=11). Universiti Malaysia Terengganu (UMT) and German-Malaysian Institute (GMI) each had 3.4% (n=8) of athletes and Universiti Malaya (UM) had a slightly lower representation at 3.0% (n=7). Other institutions such as Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS (UTP) and Universiti Malaysia Perlis (UniMAP) contributed 2.6% (n=6) and 2.1% (n=5) respectively. Smaller contingents came from Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Tunku Abdul Rahman University of Management and Technology (TAR UMT), Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS) and Institut Pendidikan Guru Malaysia (IPGM), each contributing 0.9% (n=2). Institutions like Kolej Poly-Tech Mara Kuantan (KPTM) and several Politekniks had minimal representation, with only 0.4% (n=1) each. These figures indicate a wide yet uneven participation across higher education institutions, with the host university unsurprisingly leading in athlete representation.

Table 2

Institutional Representation (Contingent/IPT)

Contingent / IPT	Frequency	Percentage
Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM)	59	25.3
Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM)	13	5.6
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu (UMT)	8	3.4
Universiti Malaya (UM)	7	3.0
Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS (UTP)	6	2.6
Universiti Malaysia Pahang (UMP)	11	4.7
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI)	2	0.9
Tunku Abdul Rahman University of Management and Technology	2	0.9

German-Malaysian Institute (GMI)	8	3.4
Unimap	5	2.1
Unimas	2	0.9
Kolej Poly-Tech Mara Kuantan (KPTM)	1	0.4
Institut Pendidikan Guru Malaysia Kampus Bahasa Melayu (IPGM)	2	0.9
Politeknik	2	0.8
Universiti Pendidikan Guru Malaysia (IPGM)	2	0.9
Total	233	100

Facilities Provided during SUKIPT

The facility reliability, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.947, indicates excellent consistency across the five items used to assess the event's facilities. As shown in Table 3, athletes' perceptions of SUKIPT UUM's facilities reveal significant areas of concern. The analysis of facilities provided during SUKIPT UUM 2024 reveals several key concerns regarding athletes' satisfaction with the event infrastructure. The reliability of the measurement instrument was confirmed with a high Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.947, indicating excellent internal consistency across the five items used to evaluate facilities. The mean scores across all items were relatively low, reflecting dissatisfaction in multiple areas. Notably, athletes expressed the greatest dissatisfaction with the sports equipment, which recorded the lowest mean score (Mean = 2.52, SD = 1.333). A total of 32.2% of respondents were "very dissatisfied" and 21.0% were "dissatisfied," suggesting that the equipment provided did not meet their expectations in terms of availability or quality. This finding supports the work of Mohd Noor et al. (2023), who emphasized that outdated or inadequate equipment can hinder athlete performance and diminish satisfaction.

Similarly, sports venues received a low mean score of 2.50 (SD = 1.303), with 30.0% of athletes reporting being "very dissatisfied" and 25.3% "dissatisfied." These results point to issues related to venue maintenance, safety and cleanliness factors that Pongsakornrunsilp and Ussahawanitchakit (2020) identified as critical to athlete satisfaction. Accommodation logistics were another area of concern. Although the mean score was slightly higher at 2.72 (SD = 1.345), 25.3% of athletes still indicated dissatisfaction with the distance of accommodations from sports venues. This aligns with findings by Ko and Pastore (2004), who highlighted the importance of proximity in shaping perceptions of service quality. Moreover, athletes expressed disappointment with the amenities provided, including Wi-Fi and laundry services, which recorded a mean of 2.59 (SD = 1.300). A combined 48.9% of respondents were either "very dissatisfied" or "dissatisfied" with these auxiliary services, reinforcing the argument made by Theodorakis et al. (2017) that such amenities significantly influence event experience. Lastly, training venues were also poorly rated (M = 2.59, SD = 1.233), with 28.3% of athletes "very dissatisfied" with their quality and accessibility. This outcome echoes Shonk and Chelladurai's (2008) assertion that well-equipped, accessible training facilities are essential to athlete preparation and satisfaction. Collectively, these findings indicate a clear need for comprehensive improvements in event facilities, which are vital to ensuring a positive and competitive experience for participants.

Table 3

Facilities provided during SUKIPT

	Percentage					Mean	SD
	Dissatisfied	Slightly Satisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Strongly Satisfied		
1) The sports equipment available at the facilities meets my needs.	32.2	21.0	24.9	12.0	9.9	2.52	1.333
2) The sports venues are well-maintained and in good condition.	30.0	25.3	22.3	15.0	7.3	2.50	1.303
3) The accommodation is conveniently located near the sports venues.	25.3	18.5	24.0	20.6	11.6	2.72	1.345
4) The necessary amenities (e.g., Wi-Fi, laundry services) are available.	27.0	21.9	28.8	14.2	8.2	2.59	1.300
5) The training venues provided are of high quality and meet my needs.	28.3	23.2	22.3	17.6	8.6	2.59	1.233
Reliability Statistics: Cronbach's Alpha	0.947						

Satisfaction with Event Quality

The analysis of athlete satisfaction with event quality at SUKIPT UUM 2024 underscores several areas of concern, particularly in relation to the facilities provided. The scale used to measure satisfaction demonstrated excellent reliability, with a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.974, indicating strong internal consistency among the six items. As reflected in Table 5, the overall mean scores were consistently low, ranging from 2.50 to 2.54 on a 5-point Likert scale, reinforcing the widespread dissatisfaction among participants. The lowest mean scores were associated with items such as satisfaction with the facilities meeting athlete expectations (M = 2.51, SD = 1.293), accessibility of facilities (M = 2.50, SD = 1.283) and the contribution of facilities to a positive experience (M = 2.50, SD = 1.273). A substantial proportion of athletes expressed dissatisfaction, with 30.0% strongly disagreeing and 22.3% disagreeing that the facilities met their expectations. This aligns with Theodorakis et al. (2017), who argue that inadequate equipment and facilities compromise fairness and athlete performance, two fundamental components of perceived event quality.

Similarly, venue maintenance was a significant issue. Negative assessments regarding cleanliness, safety, and infrastructure echoed findings by Ko and Pastore (2005), who assert that venue conditions reflect the professionalism and organizational quality of an event. Athletes' dissatisfaction may also stem from comparisons with prior experiences at similar events, as discussed by Yusof et al. (2022). Accommodation

logistics were perceived slightly more favorably, yet 25.3% of respondents were dissatisfied with the location and accessibility of lodging, a critical factor for performance and recovery, as highlighted by Mohd Noor et al. (2023).

Peripheral services such as Wi-Fi and laundry facilities were also rated poorly, with 27.0% and 21.9% expressing dissatisfaction. According to Shonk and Chelladurai (2008), these auxiliary services shape the holistic athlete experience and contribute significantly to perceived quality. Training venues, another key factor, recorded high dissatisfaction (28.3%) and a mean score of 2.59, suggesting shortcomings in facility adequacy for preparation, consistent with Pongsakornrungsilp & Ussahawanitchakit (2020). Transportation emerged as another weak area, with punctuality and accessibility receiving negative feedback from 22.3% and 26.2% of athletes, respectively. Such inefficiencies, as noted by Yusof et al. (2022), create logistical stress and disrupt athletes' schedules. The most critical concern, however, was medical and emergency services, with 30.9% dissatisfied with medical assistance and 32.2% unhappy with emergency responsiveness. These findings support Currie et al. (2021), who emphasize the importance of efficient and visible health and safety systems in sporting events.

In conclusion, while some components such as accommodation showed moderate satisfaction, the overall perception of event quality was undermined by dissatisfaction across multiple facility-related and logistical domains. These insights highlight a pressing need for improvements in infrastructure, services and event coordination to enhance the athlete experience and uphold the credibility of future SUKIPT events.

Table 5

Satisfaction with Event Quality

Satisfaction with event quality	Percentage					Total	Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree			
1) The facilities at SUKIPT met my expectations as an athlete.	70 (30.0%)	52 (22.3%)	60 (25.8%)	29 (12.4%)	22 (9.4%)	233 (100%)	2.51	1.293
2) I am satisfied with the accessibility of the facilities provided during SUKIPT.	69 (29.6%)	51 (21.9%)	59 (25.3%)	31 (13.3%)	23 (9.9%)	233 (100%)	2.50	1.283
3) The facilities contributed to a positive experience during SUKIPT.	70 (30%)	48 (20.6%)	66 (28.3%)	27 (11.6%)	22 (9.4%)	233 (100%)	2.50	1.273
4) I believe the facilities provided	69 (29.6%)	56 (24.0%)	48 (20.6%)	35 (15%)	25 (10.7%)	233 (100%)	2.52	1.293

at SUKIPT were up to the standard required for such events.									
5) The facilities provided during SUKIPT were worth the participation in the event.	71 (30.5%)	50 (21.5%)	58 (24.9%)	29 (12.4%)	25 (10.7%)	233 (100%)	2.51	1.293	
6) Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the facilities provided during SUKIPT.	66 (28.3%)	54 (23.2%)	56 (24.0%)	28 (12%)	29 (12.4%)	233 (100%)	2.54	1.313	
Reliability Statistics: Cronbach's Alpha	0.974								

Influence Of Event Quality (Facilities and Support Services), on Athletes' Satisfaction at SUKIPT

Model Fit and Explanatory Power

Before conducting the multiple regression analysis, assumptions regarding linearity, independence, homoscedasticity, and normality of residuals were evaluated. The histogram of the regression standardized residuals for the dependent variable, overall satisfaction, predicted by facility quality and support service, indicated that the residuals were well-standardized, with a mean close to zero (2.40E-16) and a standard deviation of 0.996. This supports the assumption of normality. The sample size of 233 also strengthens this assumption, as larger samples generally produce more reliable estimates of normal distribution. Table 6 presents the regression analysis results, showing that facilities and support services significantly impact athletes' satisfaction, with strong explanatory power. The model's multiple correlation coefficient ($R = 0.868$) indicates a strong positive relationship between the predictors (facilities and support services) and satisfaction. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.754$) shows that 75.4% of the variance in satisfaction is explained by event quality. The adjusted R^2 (0.752) supports the model's generalizability, suggesting minimal overfitting and high stability (Hair et al., 2020).

The standard error of estimate ($SEE = 0.635$) reflects moderate dispersion, indicating reasonably precise predictions. The F-statistic ($F = 352.749$, $p < 0.001$) confirms the model's significance, performing better than a no-predictor model. This aligns with prior studies, which emphasize that event facilities and services are key predictors of satisfaction (Yoshida & James, 2010; Theodorakis et al., 2015). The Durbin-Watson statistic (2.045) falls within the acceptable range, indicating no auto-correlation of residuals, supporting the regression model's reliability (Field, 2018).

Table 6

Model Fit and Explanatory Power

Model Summary^b										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.868 ^a	.754	.752	.63541	.754	352.749	2	230	<.001	2.045

a. Predictors: (Constant), Support Service, Facility

b. Dependent Variable: Athlete’s satisfaction

Predictor Significance and Relative Influence

Facilities were the strongest predictor of satisfaction, with a standardized beta coefficient of $\beta = 0.662$ ($p < 0.001$) (Table 7). This emphasizes the key role of sports venues, equipment and environmental conditions in shaping athletes' experiences, aligning with Kaplanidou and Vogt (2007), who found that quality facilities significantly boost satisfaction.

Support services also had a significant impact ($\beta = 0.216$, $p = 0.021$), though their effect size was smaller. These services, including medical aid and logistical support, complement the role of facilities in enhancing athlete experiences. Previous studies also highlight their importance for safety and smooth event operation (Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008; Ko & Pastore, 2005). Zero-order correlations further confirm the strength of these predictors. Facilities showed a strong correlation with satisfaction ($r = 0.865$), while support services had a slightly lower correlation ($r = 0.837$). Partial correlations, after controlling for the other predictor, were lower (facilities: 0.424; support services: 0.151), suggesting shared variance between the two predictors, likely due to overlapping perceptions of event quality (Alexandris et al., 2004).

Importantly, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for both predictors stand at 8.137, indicating a relatively high multicollinearity. While this does not exceed the critical threshold of 10, it suggests that facilities and support services may be closely related in athletes’ perception of event quality. Researchers such as O’Brien (2007) suggest exercising caution when VIF values exceed 5, as they can inflate standard errors and potentially obscure individual predictor effects. Nonetheless, in this case, the model still demonstrates significant and interpretable outcomes, affirming the essential contribution of both predictors.

Table 7

Predictor Significance and Relative Influence

Coefficients ^a											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Tolerance	Statistics VIF
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part		
1	(Constant)	.108	.100		1.077	.283					
	facilities	.718	.101	.662	7.102	<.001	.865	.424	.232	0.123	8.137
	Support service	.232	.100	.216	2.321	.021	.837	.151	.076	0.123	8.137

a. Dependent Variable: Athlete’s satisfaction

The findings are consistent with a literature emphasizing the importance of tangible and intangible elements in shaping satisfaction in the sports event context. Theodorakis et al. (2017) found that both core product quality (facilities) and peripheral services significantly influence event attendees’ satisfaction levels. Similarly, Koo et al. (2017) reported that satisfaction among athletes in multi-sport events is primarily driven by the adequacy of venues and equipment, though services such as transportation and medical support contribute to perceived professionalism and reliability. Contrasting perspectives also exist. Some researchers argue that in certain contexts, particularly community-based or smaller-scale sporting events, support services may play a more critical role than physical facilities, especially when safety and access are of concern (Bodet, 2009). However, in large-scale or elite sporting events, facilities quality tends to dominate due to its direct impact on performance and comfort.

The findings have both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, they support models of event quality that treat satisfaction as a function of both core and peripheral attributes (Brady & Cronin, 2001). Practically, event organizers should prioritize investments in high-quality sports facilities to maximize athletes’ satisfaction while ensuring that support services meet professional standards. A balanced approach that maintains high standards across both dimensions can lead to improved athlete retention, positive word-of-mouth and enhanced event reputation. Future studies may extend this analysis by exploring mediating variables such as perceived value or emotional experience and by examining whether the relative importance of predictors varies across types of sports or levels of competition (e.g., amateur vs. elite athletes).

Future Participation in the Event

The analysis of athletes’ intentions for future participation in SUKIPT events hosted by UUM highlights the critical role of facility satisfaction in shaping their willingness to return or recommend the event. The measurement of future participation demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.974, confirming the reliability of the scale used. Despite this strong reliability, the mean values across all four items indicate relatively low levels of satisfaction, suggesting widespread dissatisfaction among

participants. For the statement, "My experience with the facilities provided makes me willing to participate in future events," the mean score was 2.47 (SD = 1.313), indicating that most athletes leaned toward disagreement. This low score suggests that their overall experience with the facilities discouraged future engagement. Similarly, the item "The facilities provided met my expectations, making me more likely to return for future events," received a mean score of 2.54 (SD = 1.288), which, while slightly higher, remains below the neutral midpoint of 3.0 on a five-point Likert scale. This points to unmet expectations among many respondents. The third item, "If the facilities remain the same, I would participate in this event again," had a mean score of 2.56 (SD = 1.287), once again reflecting general reluctance among athletes to attend future events under current conditions. Lastly, "The overall quality of the event facilities encourages me to recommend this event to others," scored a mean of 2.54 (SD = 1.352), suggesting that the current standard of facilities does not motivate participants to endorse the event to their peers. These findings align with Armbrrecht (2021), who argued that unmet expectations significantly impact event perceptions and future behavior. The consistently low mean scores combined with a high proportion of respondents expressing dissatisfaction highlight the need for substantial improvements in venue quality, accessibility, and service provision.

In conclusion, athletes' future participation is closely tied to their satisfaction with the facilities. To increase the likelihood of return attendance and positive recommendations, organizers must address critical issues related to maintenance, logistical support and athlete-centered services. Improvements in these areas are essential to enhance the overall experience and ensure the long-term success of SUKIPT and similar multi-sport university events.

Table 8

Future Participation to Events

	Percentage (%)					Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
1) My experience with the facilities provided makes me willing to participate in future events.	30.9	24.9	23.2	10.7	10.3	2.47	1.313
2) The facilities provided met my expectations, making me more likely to return for future events.	27.5	22.7	27.0	14.2	8.6	2.54	1.288
3) If the facilities remain the same, I would participate in this event again.	27.5	24.0	24.5	15.9	8.2	2.56	1.287
4) The overall quality of the event facilities encourages me to recommend this event to others.	30.9	22.3	24.5	9.0	13.3	2.54	1.352
Reliability Statistics: Cronbach's Alpha	0.974						

Analysis of the Correlation Between Event Satisfaction and Future Participation

The correlation analysis results, revealed a strong positive relationship ($r = 0.929$, $p < 0.001$) between overall satisfaction and future participation in upcoming SUKIPT UUM events. This suggests that higher satisfaction levels are strongly associated with a greater likelihood of participants returning. The high correlation underscores the importance of event quality in shaping athletes' perceptions and their decisions to engage in future editions.

This finding aligns with Yoshida and James (2010), who found that event quality significantly affects satisfaction, which in turn drives future participation. Positive experiences, including a supportive environment, quality facilities and efficient management, are essential for encouraging repeat attendance. Similarly, Theodorakis et al. (2015) and Kim and Kim (2020) highlighted the role of satisfaction in fostering loyalty, with athletes more likely to return when pleased with event conditions. Hoye et al. (2018) also emphasized that satisfaction across various event aspects is essential for long-term participant engagement. Moreover, satisfied athletes are more likely to promote the event through word-of-mouth, further enhancing future participation. Allen et al. (2021) noted that high satisfaction increases the likelihood of recommendations, boosting the event's reputation. The findings from SUKIPT at UUM clearly indicate that delivering a high-quality event not only enhances satisfaction but also encourages retention and loyalty. In conclusion, the strong correlation between satisfaction and future participation confirms that high-quality event delivery is a critical strategy in sports event management. Organizers should prioritize continuous improvements in facilities, logistics and athlete-centered services to foster long-term engagement. As Chen and Gursoy (2023) emphasize, maintaining athlete satisfaction is vital for sustaining the success of recurring sports events.

CONCLUSION

This study on athletes' satisfaction with facilities and support services at the SUKIPT UUM event reveals several critical factors that influenced their overall experience. Key issues included the poor condition of sports equipment and venues, along with inadequate amenities such as Wi-Fi and laundry services. Athletes also expressed dissatisfaction with the long distances between accommodations and sports venues, as well as the substandard quality of training facilities. Support services faced significant challenges, particularly in the areas of transportation efficiency, medical assistance, and emergency responsiveness. Delays in transport and insufficient medical support notably affected athletes' perceptions and satisfaction. While some logistical aspects, such as accommodation arrangements, received relatively positive feedback, the overall findings emphasize a clear need for improvement in both infrastructure and support service delivery. The regression analysis confirmed that the quality of facilities and support services significantly influences athlete satisfaction, explaining approximately 75% of the variance. This strong relationship underscores the pivotal role that well-managed facilities and efficient services play in shaping participant experience and overall event perception.

From a practical standpoint, this study offers valuable contributions by identifying specific gaps in service delivery and facility management. Actionable recommendations include enhancing the condition and

accessibility of sports venues, improving transportation punctuality and reliability, and strengthening medical and emergency preparedness. Addressing these areas is essential to elevate athlete satisfaction and to encourage continued participation in future sports events. Theoretically, the study contributes to the growing body of knowledge in event management and sports tourism by reinforcing the connection between event quality and participant satisfaction, particularly within the context of university-level sports competitions. The findings validate the use of service quality frameworks and highlight the importance of assessing athlete experience as a key performance indicator of event success. In conclusion, the results underscore an urgent need to upgrade event facilities and support services to enhance satisfaction, foster athlete loyalty, and ensure the long-term success of university-hosted sporting events such as SUKIPT at UUM. Through strategic improvements, event organizers can significantly enhance the overall quality of future events, strengthen institutional reputation, and cultivate sustained athlete engagement.

REFERENCES

- Alexandris, K., Zahariadis, P., Tsorbatzoudis, C., & Grouios, G. (2004). An empirical investigation of the relationships among service quality, customer satisfaction, and psychological commitment in a health club context. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 4(3), 159–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184740408737413>
- Allen, J., O'Toole, W., McDonnell, I., & Harris, R. (2021). *Festival and event management: An international arts and culture perspective*. Routledge.
- Asmawi, M. A., Mohd Yusof, M. K., & Mohd Kassim, A. F. (2024). Service quality in stadium environments: Impact on customer satisfaction. *Malaysian Journal of Sport Science and Recreation*, 20(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.24191/mjssr.v20i1.960>
- Armbrecht, J. (2021). Event quality and perceived value: A study of expectations and satisfaction. *Event Management*, 25(3), 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599521X16255074515318>
- Aznan, E. A., Abu Bakar, A. H., & Mohd Rosli, N. (2024). University students' motivation to engage with sports facilities: A study on service quality. *International Journal of Sports Management*, 15(2), 270–292. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSM-09-2023-0075>
- Bodet, G. (2009). Customer satisfaction and loyalty in service: Two concepts, four constructs, several relationships. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 16(3), 156–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2008.11.001>
- Brady, M. K., & Cronin, J. J. (2001). Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: A hierarchical approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(3), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.3.34.18334>
- Chen, H., & Gursoy, D. (2023). The role of event satisfaction in predicting future engagement and word-of-mouth behavior in sports tourism. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 27(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2023.1853502>
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, D. J. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Currie, D., McCartney, G., & Pivcevic, D. (2021). Athlete health and safety at large sporting events: The development of consensus-driven guidelines. *Journal of Sports Medicine*, 35(2), 210–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsm.2021.01.004>

- Disegna, M., & Osti, L. (2012). Repeat visits and intentions to revisit a sporting event and its nearby destinations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766711428803>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hoye, R., Smith, A., Stewart, B., & Nicholson, M. (2018). *Sport management: Principles and applications*. Routledge.
- Kaplanidou, K., & Vogt, C. A. (2007). The interrelationship between sport event and destination image and sport tourists' behaviours. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3–4), 183–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080701726702>
- Karagiorgos, T., Matic, R., Maksimovic, N., Alexandris, K., Bujkovic, R., & Drid, P. (2020). Testing the influence of destination image and event quality on athletes' intentions to re-visit the city: A case study of the 2017 World Youth and Juniors' Sambo Championships in Novi Sad, Serbia. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 25(5), 390-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2020.1724187>
- Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi. (2023). *Sukan Institusi Pendidikan Tinggi (SUKIPT)*. Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. <https://www.mohe.gov.my/>
- Kim, S. H., & Kim, J. Y. (2020). Understanding the impact of event satisfaction on future participation intentions in sports events. *Journal of Sports & Recreation Management*, 42(3), 67–80.
- Kim, S., & Kim, H. (2020). Impact of event quality on attendee satisfaction and loyalty: The case of sports events. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 7(3), 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2397077X.2020.1842321>
- Ko, Y. J., & Pastore, D. L. (2004). Current issues and conceptualizations of service quality in the recreation sport industry. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13(3), 158–166.
- Ko, Y. J., & Pastore, D. L. (2005). A hierarchical model of service quality for the recreational sport industry. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14(2), 84–97.
- Koo, J., Andrew, D. P., Kim, S., & Kim, S. (2017). Effects of event quality on satisfaction and future participations at a golf tournament in Korea. *Sport Management Review*, 20(4), 506–516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2017.01.001>
- Kozanecka, B. (2025, January 17). *From chaos to clarity: Best practices for event communication strategy*. 6Connex. <https://info.6connex.com/blog/from-chaos-to-clarity-best-practices-for-event-communication-strategy>
- Lianopoulos, I., Sideridis, A., & Papadimitriou, D. (2024). Event quality and athlete satisfaction in international sports events: A systematic review. *Sport Management Review*, 27(1), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2023.08.002>
- Lianopoulos, Y., Kotsi, N., Karagiorgos, T., & Theodorakis, N.D. (2024). Experiential effects on mass sport participants' event satisfaction and future participations: Examining sensory, affective, behavioral, intellectual, and relational dimensions. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 15(2), 270–292. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-09-2023-0075>
- Liu, X., Zakaria, J., & Mohd Said, O. F. (2024). How event quality affects satisfaction and future participation: A study from the theory of planned behavior. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 55(1), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v55i1.4727>
- Liu, C. C., Hsu, M. H., Chen, Z. M., & Chuang, C. J. (2015). The interrelationship among perception of event quality, perceived value, event image, satisfaction and future participations of road runners in

- Taiwan. *Information Management and Business Review*, 7(6), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.22610/imbr.v7i6.4093>
- Matić, J., Radojević, I., & Jovanović, P. (2024). The effect of event organization on athlete satisfaction: A study of the World Wrestling Championship. *Event Management*, 28(2), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.3727/1525995214X13985337028216>
- Matić, R.M., et al. (2024). Sports event quality and athlete's future participations at the World Wrestling Championship. *Management & Marketing*, 19(3), 419–440. <https://doi.org/10.2478/mmcks-2024-0019>
- Micklema, M. (2024, October 27). *Effective event planning: Streamlining logistics and coordination*. Eventflare.<https://eventflare.io/journal/effective-event-planning-streamlining-logistics-and-coordination>
- Mohd Aznan, E.A., Md Yusof, M.K., Mohd Kassim, A.F., Abu Bakar, A.H., & Mohd Rosli, N. (2024). Association between service quality and motivation to engage with sports facilities: A study among university students. *Malaysian Journal of Sport Science and Recreation*, 20(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.24191/mjssr.v20i1.960>
- Mohd Noor, M. N., Abdullah, A. S., & Yusof, A. (2023). Athletes' satisfaction with sports facilities and services: A case study of a national university-level event. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 6(8), 5532–5540. <https://ijsshr.in/v6i8/82.php>
- Mohd Noor, M. N., Yusof, A., & Awang, K. W. (2023). Factors influencing satisfaction and future participation among sports event participants in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Sport Science and Recreation*, 19(1), 45–60.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 41(5), 673–690. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-015-0607-8>
- Papadimitriou, D., & Karteroliotis, K. (2000). *The service quality expectations in private sport and fitness centers: A re-examination of the factor structure*. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 9(3), 157–164.
- Pongsakornrunsilp, S., & Ussahawanitchakit, P. (2020). Service quality of sport venues and customer loyalty: The role of perceived value and satisfaction. *The Journal of Sports Science and Technology*, 20(1), 22–35.
- Rozman Azram, M. S., Abu Bakar, M. R., & Samah, A. H. (2023). Impact of event quality on athletes' satisfaction: The role of sports facilities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism*, 20(4), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apjt.2023.06.011>
- Setyaningtyas, T., Kirana, A. N., & Wicaksono, M. A. (2021). Relationship analysis of destination image, sports involvement, event quality and travel motives as an antecedent factors on revisit intention in recurring running sports-event. *The Winners*, 22(2), 137-146. <https://doi.org/10.21512/tw.v22i2.7434>
- Setyaningtyas, T. (2021). Relationship analysis of destination image, sports involvement, event quality, and travel motives as antecedent factors on future participation in recurring running sports events. *The Winners Journal*. <https://www.academia.edu/59174695>
- Shonk, D. J., & Chelladurai, P. (2008). Athlete satisfaction in organized sports: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(2), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.1123>

- Theodorakis, N., Alexandris, K., Kaplanidou, K., & Papadimitriou, D. (2017). Event quality and loyalty among runners with different running involvement levels: The case of “The Alexander the Great” International Marathon. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 8(3), 292-307. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-08-2016-0057>
- Wu, H., Zhang, J., & Yan, X. (2022). Service quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions in professional sports events: A study of audience experience. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 23(2), 301–317. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-03-2021-0052>
- Yoshida, M., & James, J. D. (2010). Customer satisfaction with game and service experiences: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Sport Management*, 24(3), 338–361.
- Yusof, S. M., Latif, S. A., & Ali, R. (2022). Athletes' satisfaction with sports event facilities and support services. *Journal of Sports Event Management*, 16(3), 149-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2432745X.2022.1806019>