



# Towards a critical sport heritage: implications for sport tourism

Gregory Ramshaw & Sean James Gammon

To cite this article: Gregory Ramshaw & Sean James Gammon (2017) Towards a critical sport heritage: implications for sport tourism, *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 21:2, 115-131, DOI: [10.1080/14775085.2016.1262275](https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2016.1262275)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2016.1262275>



Published online: 01 Dec 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1063



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 6 View citing articles [↗](#)



## Towards a critical sport heritage: implications for sport tourism

Gregory Ramshaw<sup>a</sup> and Sean James Gammon<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA; <sup>b</sup>Sport, Tourism and the Outdoors, The University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK

### ABSTRACT

This paper reflects upon the development and increased acceptance for heritage becoming a key component of sport tourism research. The original sport heritage typology, as posited by Ramshaw and Gammon [2005, *More than just Nostalgia? Exploring the heritage/sport tourism nexus*. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 10(4), 229–241], is re-examined through a more critical lens, revealing additional dimensions that help augment its key components. More specifically, it is argued that future studies should consider the more intangible features of sport heritage, as well as acknowledging the expanding global nature of sport and its impact upon fandom. Also, the case is made for research to explore the dissonance inherent in much of sports heritage, as well as determining where the power lies in allocating and championing current sport heritages. Lastly, the more general implications to the field of sport tourism are offered with particular regard to motivation, place, and consumption.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 6 September 2016  
Accepted 15 November 2016

### KEYWORDS

Sport tourism; heritage studies; heritage sport tourism; theory

## Introduction

In 2005, the *Journal of Sport Tourism* published our paper, ‘More than just Nostalgia: Exploring the heritage/sport tourism nexus’ (Ramshaw & Gammon, 2005). In it, we argued that heritage – rather than nostalgia – ought to frame the discussions about those sport tourism journeys and attractions based on the sporting past. Our reasoning was based on the fact that much of the sporting past is not particularly the stuff of nostalgia, and that to accurately reflect the many tourist attractions and touristic experiences that involve the sporting past, we must make room for the fact that while much of the sporting past ought to be celebrated and even nostalgized, many of these sporting pasts are also negative, involve deep social conflict and, as such, are not celebratory. In terms of framing what we termed ‘heritage sport tourism’, rephrasing the ‘nostalgia sport tourism’ title that Gibson (1998) proposed, we proposed a typology of sport heritage: tangible immovable (e.g. sports venues), tangible movable (e.g. sports memorabilia and artefacts), intangibles (e.g. sporting chants), and goods and services with a heritage component (e.g. retro sports apparel). Of course, this typology is permeable; a chant or tradition (intangible) may have to be performed at a particular venue (tangible immovable) in order to have any meaning.

However, this typology was meant to reflect the broad range of sport heritage-based places, products, and experiences that the sport tourist might encounter. Furthermore we also proposed that many sport heritages fall into two categories which, again, may be permeable: the *heritage of sport* whereby the heritage is about the sport itself, be it famous games, records, and achievements, and *sport as heritage* whereby the sporting feat has broader social, cultural, and political implications.

In this commentary, we reflect on the current state of sport heritage research, particularly as it relates to sport tourism, and revisit our discussion of the 'heritage/sport tourism nexus'. In particular, we suggest some ways in which critical heritage studies – an area that was still in its infancy in 2005 – might reframe some of the debates and discussion about heritage sport tourism. Finally, we propose some new approaches to heritage sport tourism that, we hope, advances sport tourism scholarship in this field.

### **Heritage sport tourism – where are we now?**

Over the past decade, we have seen significant interest in sport heritage from many different segments of the academy, and not just from sport tourism. Although we believe our paper played some role in this increased interest and attention, there appears to be a broad recognition throughout various disciplines and schools of knowledge about the importance of sport-based heritage. Most notably, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) named the 'heritage of sport' as their theme for 2016 (Theme 2016, 2016), while UNESCO's intangible cultural heritage list includes, among other sport-based practices, the recognition and protection of the ancient Irish sport of hurling, the traditional games and sports of Flanders in Belgium, and Korean martial arts (Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2016). Similarly, historians (Hill, Moore, & Wood, 2012; Phillips, 2012; Wilson, 2014), geographers (Strohmayer, 2013), archaeologists (Moore, Richardson, & Corkill, 2014), managers (Stride, Wilson, & Thomas, 2013), conservators (Bairner, 2015; Pfleeger, Seifried, & Soebbing, 2013), and marketers (Kellett, 2015) have all taken some interest in sport heritage in recent years, and though some of these works intersect with sport tourism, much of sport heritage research exists outside of tourism.

That said, the notion that the sporting past is part of tourism is not new and certainly pre-dates our contribution to the literature (see Gibson, 1998; Redmond, 1973; Snyder, 1991). Since we suggested a focused approach to 'heritage sport tourism', there have been a number of tourism-based approaches to sport heritage. Many of these sport heritage approaches were the continuation of our own work and interest in sport heritage, including sport heritage's links to large-scale events (Gammon, Ramshaw, & Waterton, 2013; Hinch & Ramshaw, 2014; Ramshaw & Hinch, 2006), the role of heritage-based stadia and sporting venues as tourist attractions (Gammon, 2011; Ramshaw & Gammon, 2010; Ramshaw, Gammon, & Huang, 2013), athletes as a form of 'living' sport heritage attraction (Gammon, 2014; Ramshaw, 2010), and personal sport heritages and tourism (Ramshaw, 2014a). We have been pleased with the numerous approaches to sport heritage and tourism outside of our work, including specific examinations of stadia as heritage-based attractions (Bairner, 2015; Gordon, 2013; Wright, 2012), tourism associated with sports halls of fame (Johnson, Giannoulakis, Tracy, & Ridley, 2015), tourism and heritage-based sporting events (Derom, VanWynsberghe, & Scheerder, 2015; Pinson, 2016;

Ulvnes & Solberg, 2016), sport-specific heritage tourism (Baum & Butler, 2014), personal sport heritages and tourism (Joseph, 2011), and dissonant sport heritage and tourism (Phillips, Osmond, & Morgan, 2014), to name but a few. We have also been pleased to see that discussions of heritage and sport tourism have become part of more generalist sport tourism texts, including in Weed and Bull (2012), Higham and Hinch (2009), and Hinch and Higham (2011), as well as heritage studies collections such as that by Waterton and Watson (2015).

However it is important to point out that the relationship between sport and heritage can be viewed (and consequently researched) from broadly two perspectives. First, we can explore *sport as heritage*. This is where sport in and of itself becomes part of a community's, region's, and/or nation's fabric. It occurs when its practices, its rituals, and its history transcend sport and become representative of a people. Consequently sport can help nurture and solidify collective identities, as well as offering insightful actions that communicate to the curious visitor what a place or community is really like. In many cases sport, in all its guises, presents a backstage context to a people at play, and as a result may offer more authentic tourist experiences of a destination (Higham & Hinch, 2009).

A second approach to explore the heritage sport relationship is to focus on the *heritage of sport* which celebrates and/or acknowledges the achievements and events within sport itself, creating a narrative strictly contained within its own culture (Ramshaw & Gammon, 2005). This most commonly manifests itself through the veneration, and in some cases protection, of important objects and performances peculiar to specific sports. Whilst our work predominantly focuses on the *heritage of sport* and its implications on the field of tourism, it also incorporates and acknowledges sport's ability to impact upon wider heritage initiatives and concerns, which are more often considered when viewing *sport as heritage*.

### **Critical heritage studies and the sport heritage typology**

In the past decade, heritage studies have undergone a significant shift. Smith (2006), in particular, proposed that heritage is not a 'thing' *per se*, but the values and ideologies we place in objects, places, rituals, and traditions. Furthermore, the heritagization process is subject to an 'authorized heritage discourse' – that is to say, there is a legitimization and delegitimization of who may create, interpret, and alter particular heritages. As such, the dichotomy of tangible and intangible heritage has largely been discarded in critical heritage studies, although it is still employed by heritage organizations involved in recognition, conservation, and protection of heritage, such as UNESCO, while questions of power have become paramount. Of course, some of these ideas have been in heritage studies for some time, particularly Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge's (2000) assertion that all heritage involves dissonance. However, Smith's (2006) arguments have carried significant weight in how heritage is understood, particularly in terms of what heritage 'is' as well as the political and ideological aspects at the heart of all forms of heritage representation. More recently, scholars such as Waterton and Watson (2015) have further emphasized the discursive and performative aspects of heritage, while Harrison (2013) – though accepting that values and ideologies are, in fact, the contents of heritage – argues that heritage nevertheless still has a material reality.

Approaches to sport heritage have been, by and large, focused on the tangible aspects of the sporting past (such as venues and artefacts) and, with a few exceptions, have looked more at the management and interpretation of sport heritage rather than its use as a vehicle of power and representation. Of course, the main reason we advocated a shift to 'heritage' from 'nostalgia' in sport tourism was that we recognized that many sporting pasts are dissonant and do carry significant social and political baggage. That said, sport heritage research must do more to incorporate a critical heritage studies lens. As such, a re-examination of the heritage sport tourism typology we proposed in 2005 (tangible immovable sport heritage, tangible movable sport heritage, intangible sport heritage, and goods and services with a sport heritage component), with a view to more critical approaches to heritage studies, is necessary. We contend that the sport heritage typology does not need to be altered as much as understood within the new realities of heritage studies.

### ***Tangible immovable***

Tangible immovable sport heritage is a category of sport heritage that encompasses sport heritage buildings or places; that is to say, a famous golf course or historic stadium that remains *in situ* and cannot be moved. Sports venues and facilities are certainly some of the most noticeable forms of sport heritage, and are often icons of particular teams, sports, and communities (Gammon, 2011). In many cases, the value of particular sports venues are assumed and considered universal. Perhaps a famous event happened at the venue, a long-standing tournament is associated with the sporting place, or the site/venue has historic and/or architectural value. However, how a site has become heritagized – that is to say, how and why a particular sporting venue is considered heritage – has largely been overlooked. The heritagization process could be informed through a broader engagement with critical heritage studies. Most notably, the notion that heritage is ultimately about the present – present tastes, present politics, present economics, and so on – is broadly accepted in heritage studies (see Smith, 2006; Timothy, 2011) and would inform how some venues transition from 'decrepit' to 'beloved'. Similarly, age and aesthetics often have little to do with the heritagization process, as many venues with limited architectural value and of a relatively recent age are nevertheless often positioned as heritage (Trumpbour & Womack, 2016).

Shea (2014), for example, in his exploration of Chicago's famous Wrigley Field, the historic baseball stadium and home of the Cubs baseball team, argues that many of the values attributed to Wrigley – in particular that it is an authentic, historic, intimate ballpark – are relatively recent inventions. For much of Wrigley's history, it was considered a new and relatively comfortable place to watch a baseball game (particularly compared with other baseball stadiums at the time). More recently, its age was actually considered a detriment to increased revenue generation, and it has only been in the past two generations that the heritage of the stadium became an asset – again, as compared to many of its contemporaries which were often cold, symmetrical, domed, multipurpose concrete stadiums, or retro replicas which tried to imitate places like Wrigley. Similarly, Friedman's (2007) exploration found a similar heritagization process for Boston's Fenway Park, another historic baseball stadium and home of the Red Sox baseball team. Like Wrigley, Fenway's age was considered a detriment. However, over the past 15 years, the Red Sox franchise found ways to commodify and exploit the stadium's heritage, so much so that the

stadium generates some of the highest revenue of any in Major League Baseball, despite the fact it has one of the smallest capacities. Furthermore, Fenway Park was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2012 for its architectural, historical, and cultural significance to the city, region, and nation (2012), although such designations have been relatively rare for sporting venues until recent years. Beyond the symbolic importance this designation offers, which in and of itself is an important part of heritage, as well as the protection such designation offers in terms of the integrity of the site and its surroundings, the designation also allows for tax incentives for upkeep and maintenance of Fenway Park (Finucane, 2012). Ramshaw and Gammon (2010) also explain that tours of Twickenham Stadium, home of England's rugby union team, position the venue as symbolic of a particular – and perhaps, antiquated – form of English culture and identity, for both economic and cultural reasons. In this case, ideological constructs are part of the heritage process in addition to financial considerations.

This is, of course, not to suggest that tangible immovable sport sites like Wrigley Field or Fenway Park are not important to recognize and conserve. It is also not to suggest that there is necessarily anything wrong with commodifying the heritage of tangible immovable places, or utilizing their historic designations for cultural or financial gain. Rather, it is to say that heritage is not a benign object, but rather an active process of meaning-making which is tied to present needs, circumstances, and ideologies. For example, the heritage values associated with sporting venues are changing, as there has been a recent push to conserve the Houston Astrodome, which was a multipurpose, symmetrical, domed stadium that became the template for many similar 'placeless' venues throughout the world (Trumpbour & Womack, 2016). Furthermore, as Waterton and Watson (2015) explain, heritage is a discursive process; language is essential in the creation of heritage. From a critical heritage perspective, and as Smith (2006) in particular explains, *all* heritage is therefore intangible; the tangible/intangible duality is archaic as all heritage is, ultimately, about the values we place in objects and not the objects themselves. Of course, sport itself is an intangible process – but intimately connected to tangible places like stadiums. This rejection of the tangible/intangible duality places particular strains of heritage studies in conflict with one another, particularly those from more conservationist paradigms. Similarly, the heritage values of sporting venues can be highly dissonant. A supporter of Manchester United might view Old Trafford as fundamentally part of his or her personal, civic, and national identity – whereas a non-supporter may view the venue with ignorance or indifference. As such, when we look at tangible immovable sport heritage, we must consider that these sites and structures are not *inherently* heritage, but rather the fact that they are understood, discussed, and recognized as part of a broader process. That said, Harrison (2013) contends that critical heritage studies has gone too far in emphasizing the discursive practice of heritage, noting that all heritage (even that considered 'intangible') involves some form of materiality in that it creates 'things', exists in landscapes and other spaces, and involves bodies of human and non-human actors. As such, even when considering the recognition and protection of tangible immovable sport heritage, we cannot deny its materiality though, at the same time, we must understand that its heritagization is not innate but, rather, a discursive process.

The recognition that intangible sport heritage has a material reality has several implications. First, the discursive and dynamic process of heritage will, inevitably, change the meanings given to tangible immovable sport heritage. A sporting venue may acquire

particular heritage meanings depending on, for example, the national or global scale of the venue's infamy. Sites like Hillsborough Stadium and the New Orleans Superdome gained international notoriety because of tragedy, and these tragedies changed the heritage meanings ascribed to these particular venues. Second, some tangible immovable sporting places are not necessarily ascribed heritage meanings. Perhaps this is because some sporting venues are commonplace, unremarkable, or may not be linked to broader social memory or, in some cases, not particularly beloved. The discursive process of heritage suggests that anything could be heritage but, of course, we know that not everything actually is heritage. Similarly, some tangible immovable sporting places are denied any heritage significance by supporters, or may be ascribed differing – and, perhaps, dissonant – heritage meanings by different groups. West Ham United's new home, London Stadium, has been rejected by some supporters because of their strong attachment to the club's former home, Upton Park (MacInnes, 2016), while the stadium's heritage might be more strongly linked to the 2012 Olympic Games, where it served as the event's primary venue. Finally, some tangible immovable sport heritage sites become more aligned with intangible sport heritage, albeit with a different material reality and different heritage discourses. This is particularly the case when a sports venue is demolished or significantly adapted and renovated for a different, non-sport use, though the important spaces of the former site are marked and memorialized. Wood and Gabie's (2011) public art project called 'The Trophy Room' about Ayresome Park, former home of Middlesbrough Football Club which was demolished to make way for a housing project in 1996, included the use of sculpture to mark prominent places at the former ground (such as at one of the penalty kick spots or at the centre spot). This project was not, as Wood and Gabie describe, to simply mark the history of the venue, but rather to 'recapture place, memory and meaning, to create new interest in history and heritage, and to generate new tourist markets and destinations' (pp. 1199–1200). As such, sport heritage itself can still be immovable and still be tangible, but the materiality and the heritage discourses have changed.

### ***Tangible movable***

Tangible movable sport heritage is a type of sport heritage that considers primarily movable objects and artefacts that are associated with particular sports, athletes, events, or sporting practices. In general, tangible movable sport heritage is related to the sports-based artefact collections of museums. Like tangible immovable sport heritage, tangible movable sport heritage reflects the notion that sporting artefacts are 'inherently' heritage; that the discursive practice of heritage plays little role in their construction. Such notions are echoed by organizations such as the UK-based Sport in Museums Network, which describe collections of sporting artefacts as a synonym for sport heritage ("About Us", 2016). The broader considerations of how, by whom, and to what end sport heritage is collected and interpreted are often not considered when exploring tangible movable sport heritage, although Moore (2012) suggests that many sports museum directors and curators often take more critical approaches to sporting collections, though many sporting collections are nevertheless presented uncritically.

Perhaps one of the unique characteristics of sport heritage, at least in relation to other forms and types of heritage, is its relationship with living artefacts (Gammon, 2014;

Ramshaw, 2010). That is to say, many of the tangible movable 'objects' in sport heritage are, in fact, the athletes themselves. As Gammon (2014) argues, in considering the athlete as an 'object' there is an inverse relationship with time in comparison with other forms of heritage. That is to say, unlike other heritage objects whose values are enhanced as they age, sporting heroes might lose some of their lustre:

A very different relationship exists between the quiescent features of valued sporting artefacts and the corporeal qualities of the living. For example, those who have an interest in heritage are often influenced and impressed by the patina of age in some traditional tangible objects such as buildings and pieces of art. Sports heroes age and change – we cannot stop that – though their inextricable physical decline can at times sadden us, while simultaneously reminding us of our own mortality. We cannot preserve or protect them in the same way as we can of other inanimate objects. (p. 60–61)

Ramshaw (2010) further argues that such 'athlete artefacts' serve other purposes for sports museums as well, particularly as a unique and authentic lure for visitors and tourists (who may wish to see them perform, or meet them at an autograph signing) as well as a source of inspiration for young people to take up particular sports (and, thereby, creating future sporting artefacts). Perhaps only other forms of contemporary popular culture, such as music, have similar forms of living artefacts as well as the sites and museums to 'display' them. Furthermore, many living sport artefacts are not associated with museums at all. In the West Indies, for example, retired cricketers such as Viv Richards are used in tourism development, as sports stars are often the most well-known people associated with particular locations. There are also many sporting events that feature former sporting stars, such as Professional Golfers Association's (PGA) Champions Tour. In these, we can think about athletes having 'second lives' as heritage icons (Harrison, 2013).

In the original article we acknowledged that there existed an element of fluidity within the sport heritage categorization, stating that, 'Sport-related heritage, like other forms of heritage, often fall into multiple categorizations and, as such, certain types of heritage could potentially reside within one or more of these categories' (Ramshaw & Gammon, 2005, 233). For example, sporting goods and retro apparel can celebrate past glories in a more tangible way – and so potentially sit in both types. But what we did not discuss was how the transformation of certain forms of sports heritage can lead to some objects and practices moving from one category to another. Although many sports venues are personally and collectively imbued with heritage status, very few are formally designated and listed through legislation (see Gammon, 2007). As a result, dated and tired sports structures can be replaced by modern equivalents that provide not only superior spectator facilities but also increased seating capacities. These commercially driven developments often lead to teams/clubs moving sites permanently, or temporarily, when their original venue is being rebuilt and/or augmented. It is important to mention here that we are not suggesting that the immovable have become movable – but rather, that replaced stadia can evolve into more intangible manifestations of heritage, through fan remembrance and lamentation. The old stadium takes on different heritage forms as it is kept alive through oral histories and other audio-visual recordings, which can then be housed and exhibited in sports museums. Conversely, the intangible can become tangible which can be best illustrated by the ossification of great sporting moments through monumentation. Whilst the impact of some great sporting achievement may start to fade, it

can be (re)remembered through sculpture and other art forms such as photography, paintings, etc. (Stride et al., 2013).

Such mobility between categories does not illustrate the indeterminacy of sports heritage, only that, like other non-sporting heritage, it can evolve into other, no-less important, forms. Moreover, it illustrates sport's importance; as even when some heritage component is lost, it can be replaced by alternative forms of remembrance that can, over time, become heritage itself. This can be seen in many new types of sports museums, such as the College Football Hall of Fame in Atlanta, which houses very few artefacts and it, rather, is focused on a more experiential approach to sport heritage, akin to a form of guided nostalgia through audio/visual displays and hands-on games (such as kicking a football through the goalposts). It is important to note that although sport in and of itself can be viewed as intangible heritage due to its obvious performative elements; it is the accompanying tangible accoutrements that tend to be referred to most in the literature.

### ***Intangibles***

Intangible sport heritage is meant to capture those traditions, rituals, chants, and spectacles that, though they may be inextricably linked to tangible sport places, can nevertheless not be touched or visited in the same way as tangible immovable or tangible movable sport heritage. The most notable of intangible sport heritages might be the chants from terraces of football stadiums in England, many of which are traditional and may reference historical events and intercity rivalries, and will often reference broader heritages (particularly involving class and religion) though not often in the most flattering or positive way (Foer, 2005). Other intangible sporting traditions might be the particular norms of sports, the 'unwritten rules' of conduct. For example, the notion of the ice hockey 'code' – particularly in terms of what is and is not permissible in terms of violence on the ice – might be considered an intangible heritage. Similarly, the idea of 'walking' in cricket, when a batsman knows he or she has been bowled or caught out, does not argue with the umpire, and simply walks off the pitch, might also be considered a kind of intangible sport heritage where the values of the sport are upheld through players' conduct.

Of course, the notion of what is and is not 'tangible' and 'intangible' heritage represents one of the major epistemological divides in heritage studies. As mentioned, critical heritage studies largely view all heritage as intangible, though Harrison's (2013) contention that even discursive approaches to heritage are ultimately related to materiality has significant merit. In practice, however, the idea of tangible and intangible heritage being two separate forms and types of heritage has largely been solidified within broader heritage conservation organizations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS. UNESCO's intangible heritage convention, in particular, aims to protect living cultures from disappearing and, in recent years, sporting practices like Hurling have been listed on the intangible cultural heritage list. Similarly, ICOMOS declared sport heritage as their theme for 2016, though their interest is largely in sites and monuments of sport rather than sporting cultures and practices. While both critical heritage studies and more traditional heritage conservation have not found common ground yet in 'where' heritage resides (Harrison, 2013) and there remains significant value in understanding both tangible and intangible heritage as separate spheres, particularly in protection and management, there are still many ways

that critical heritage studies inform intangible sport heritage (even if one accepts heritage as a tangible/intangible binary).

The idea of heritage as a kind of performance, in particular, has gained much currency in heritage studies in recent years, with Waterton and Watson (2015) in particular arguing that performance is perhaps the most important way in which heritage is understood and articulated in the public sphere. Traditional approaches to heritage performance (particularly in the UNESCO intangible cultural heritage paradigm) would perhaps put this into a particular observable, recognizable, and kinetic form of heritage, such as a traditional dance or ritual. However, a broader idea of heritage performance, first proposed by Bagnall (2003), is about the interaction between actors – or between actors and a particular site and object – rather than the particular ‘heritage attributes’ of a site, object, or spectacle. In this notion of heritage performance, heritage is being constructed and not simply consumed; it is both emotional as well as physical or, in Smith’s (2006) view, heritage is both an act of ‘being’ as well as ‘doing’. Such an approach to heritage lends itself to many forms of sport heritage, from the identification of being a fan of a particular team or sport, to the sense of belonging, reminiscing, and even actively forgetting or rejecting particular sporting pasts. Areas of fandom become even more complex and layered for diasporic communities, where competing national loyalties, heritages, and traditions may be articulated through sport (Burdsey, 2006; Fletcher, 2012). As such, intangible sport performance need not just be the chant itself (though, it can also be this), but the very notion of fandom and who (and how) that experience is shared.

Such existential notions of intangible sport heritage also lend themselves to other forms of sports experiences. Old timers’ tournaments and journeys to play the sports of one’s youth might be partly nostalgic in nature, but may also be about reinforcing and remembering identities forged through sport (Joseph, 2011). Genealogical or trips about personal heritage are also an emerging kind of intangible journey, though according to Timothy (1997) they are often overlooked in heritage. Ramshaw’s (2014a) narrative of discovering and imagining a connection with his grandfather through visiting a particular cricket ground reinforces the idea of more existential forms of sport heritage, ones that are not reliant on ‘verifiable’ heritage but rather of more imagined connections.

### **Goods and services**

Heritage is often used as a style or brand in sport. Indeed, there are numerous examples of the axiom ‘what is old, is new’ in sports merchandise. Much like Hewison’s (1989) discussion that the word ‘antique’ is used as a verb in heritage merchandising (‘The replica sign has been antiqued’) which is meant to instill a sense of age and *gravitas* (and, therefore, authenticity and value) in a commodity, sports merchandising has fully embraced the heritage aesthetic. Indeed, as Stride, Thomas, and Ramshaw (2015) argue, it has only been recently that leagues and teams embraced producing replica apparel for the general public and, in a short time, demand for apparel grew to include casual fans and non-fans as sportswear became a particular fashion choice in and of itself. Thus, it is not surprising that sports ‘heritage wear’ is simply an evolution of sportswear as fashion. Throwback jerseys abound in professional sport, and have done for some time, but many other licensed brands – with names like ‘Old Time Hockey’, ‘47 Brand’, ‘The Old Fashioned Football Shirt Company’, and ‘Ebbets Field Flannels’ – create faded, retro and ‘antiqued’ sport

heritage apparel such as t-shirts and hoodies. Even more striking is that some leagues even sell merchandise of teams that no longer exist (and, in many cases, were relocated or retracted by the leagues themselves). One can go to the 'Vintage Hockey' section of the National Hockey League's online shop to purchase apparel from the Hartford Whalers (relocated to Raleigh, North Carolina in 1997), Quebec Nordiques (relocated to Denver, Colorado in 1996), the Kansas City Scouts (which became the Colorado Rockies in 1976, and then the New Jersey Devils in 1982), and the California Golden Seals (which later became the Cleveland Barons in 1976, merged with the Minnesota North Stars in 1978, and then became the Dallas Stars in 1993). Similarly, one can still purchase apparel of the Montreal Expos baseball club on Major League Baseball's online shop, despite the fact that the team relocated to Washington, DC in 2004. Of course, some pasts are more saleable than others. The NHL shop does not have merchandise of other dead franchises, including both the Atlanta Flames (relocated to Calgary, Alberta in 1980) and Atlanta Thrashers (relocated to Winnipeg, Manitoba in 2011), and the first incarnation of the Winnipeg Jets (relocated to Phoenix, Arizona in 1996), among others. As such, it appears that novelty, authenticity, and originality are as much a pull for sport heritage consumers as long, successful, and memorable pasts.

Of course, the commodification of sport heritage goes well beyond apparel. Fantasy camps remain a staple of the sporting landscape, where fans may (for a hefty fee) play with their sporting heroes, normally at a memorable or historic location (such as at a professional stadium) (Gammon, 2004). Similarly, Masters events in golf and tennis provide opportunities for fans to see the stars of yesterday (even if these athletes have lost a step or two) (Gammon, 2014). However, more and more often, heritage is a planned component of the sporting landscape. The proliferation of outdoor hockey events across North America and Europe, for example, espouse the roots and traditions of the sport while also providing unique spectating experiences (Ramshaw & Hinch, 2006). These types of heritage events are also significant profit centres, as events like outdoor hockey games are significant money-makers for franchises and leagues alike, and often generate their own event-specific heritage merchandise (Ramshaw, 2014b). Roberts' (2014) discussions of the heritagization of popular music, the culture of sport (which is seemingly about the present), and the heritage of sport (which is seemingly about the past) are now virtually indistinguishable. Indeed, the temporal shift – which Lowenthal (1985) discussed – makes the past and present almost simultaneous. Indeed, when the first major outdoor game occurred in Edmonton in 2003, the franchise that organized the event had an online poll asking where the event ranked in the history of hockey – a week before the event took place (Ramshaw & Hinch, 2006).

As Harrison (2013) explains, much of heritage today is about coping with the remnants of the past and creating a 'second life' for these remnants through tourism and other forms of commodification. Although Harrison was largely referring to built heritage and physical industrial structures, the idea that a sports league or club would mine the relics of the past to develop a new and novel product requires some examination. Indeed, the commodification of sporting heritages also make us reconsider what is an acceptable past, particularly when yesterday's failed franchise becomes today's heritage t-shirt. Similarly, sport heritage commodities reveal much about heritage in the late-modern period. Seemingly, many of these heritages are about heritage performance (Bagnall, 2003; Waterton & Watson, 2015), witnessing one at a sport heritage event, being a part of one at a

fantasy camp, or differentiating ourselves through heritage-based apparel. Similarly, heritage could also be a hook to motivate fandom. Whilst heritage may well play a part in the socialization process of being a fan, such as an individual being drawn to attend an event due to its inherent heritage qualities, less is known about its general impact on fan motivation. The need to interact, share, and be a part of a sports event may stem from a deeper desire to tap into the heritage of the places and communities that fans reside in. Furthermore, to be actively involved in supporting a team and/or sport could also be a means by which individuals could retain a connection with their personal heritage. To embrace and perform in the many traditions and rituals associated with attending an event could be a means by which to pay homage to the experiences fans once shared with friends and family who are no longer around (Gammon & Ramshaw, 2013). Indeed, more contentiously, it has been suggested that the lingering and stubborn practices of spectator violence may have a heritage component, partially propagated by the media who revisit and re-produce the deeds of yesteryear in an entertaining and exciting style (Rehling, 2011). Also, unique heritage products could potentially solidify fandom. One of the reasons for the launch of the outdoor hockey game trend in 2003 was that the Edmonton Oilers, organizer of the Heritage Classic, needed something special to retain their fan base after years of poor play (Ramshaw, 2014b). Indeed, sport heritage goods and services appear to have a very distinctive purpose beyond just being goods and services. Furthermore, they reflect some of the current issues and trends in critical heritage studies, namely the process of heritagization whereby past/present become indistinguishable as well as the mining of various pasts to find 'second lives' of heritage to meet consumer demand.

To what extent that heritage can be considered as a key component of fan motivation is unclear. Whilst Wann, Melnick, Russell, and Pease's (2001) study does not acknowledge heritage in their findings, it is clear that the identification and recognition of what drives fandom is both complex and multi-layered. As a result, heritage may well be an underlying factor that influences fan behaviour, but we need empirical evidence to examine this proposition further.

### **Implications for sport tourism**

Both sport tourism and heritage studies have changed immensely in the past decade. Sport tourism has become more systematic in its approach, reflecting the calls by Weed (2005) for sport tourism to be more than just throwing metaphorical 'bricks on a pile' and to build an edifice of knowledge. Similarly, the turn towards more critical perspectives in heritage studies in the past decade have profoundly influenced heritage-based research, particularly in understanding how heritage is created, by whom it is created, and to what ends it is created. As such, the initial steps linking heritage and sport tourism, as we proposed in our 2005 typology, does not need to be reimagined as much as re-articulated through the lens of better understandings in both sport tourism and heritage studies.

To start, research about heritage sport tourism should attempt to reflect an understanding of some aspects of the relationship between heritage and power. Too often, sport heritage is viewed as neutral, apolitical, or benign. Reflecting on who creates sport heritage, for whom, and to what end – or, more precisely, some understanding of Smith's (2006) *authorized heritage discourse* – would bring a greater richness to our understanding of how

heritage and sport tourism interact. This is not to say that all heritage sport tourism research must be couched in the language of critical heritage studies, but rather should demonstrate an understanding that sport heritage does not just simply 'appear' and that there are often competing ideologies behind its creation, commodification, and consumption. Further, an understanding that sport heritage is often not simply about celebration and accomplishment – a major point in our typology – needs to be restated. The fact that many sport heritages are being used to challenge dominant heritage narratives (Ramshaw, 2017), and that the touristic appeal of some sport heritages are based more on tragedy than triumph (Moore et al., 2014), needs to be realized. This is particularly the case in terms of sport heritage that is often overlooked or marginalized. Sport has many excluded pasts, particularly in terms of gender, class, race, sexuality, and ability, and a broader recognition of those marginalized pasts would not only lend to the trustworthiness of sport heritage attractions, but perhaps appeal to new and different audiences – some of whom may have limited interest in sport but who may be interested in social or political heritages. Similarly, sport heritage – at least as currently studied – tends to be focused mainly on European locations or sites of the former British Empire, such as Canada, the United States, and Australia, so there may be some geographical exclusion in representations of sport heritage. In addition, much of sport heritage is focused on the famous or professional, in large part because of the commodification of sport heritage for tourism, so amateur or community sport heritage may also be discounted. Although sport heritage attractions may not always address issues of power, sport heritage research should attempt to understand and recognize broader forms of representation and how particular aspects of the sporting past came to be enshrined and celebrated.

In the past decade, the globalization of sporting heritages has become ever more present. Global broadcasts of events becoming part of basic cable or online viewing subscriptions, the mobility of both spectators and competitions becoming more prevalent, and the rise of social media in the past decade as an integral part of sports media and communication have major implications for heritage sport tourism. Now, more than ever, sport heritage is a global phenomenon and may be a way of first experiencing or deepening fandom. For example, as of 2015, nearly 800,000 overseas visitors visit Britain each year specifically to watch football and visit famous football grounds (Macgowan, 2015). Fans are often driven to particular grounds and teams because of their heritage and history, but there are questions about whether tourists' presence at matches actually change the very heritage they hope to experience, while also potentially denying local fans the opportunity to be a part of their own heritage, traditions, and culture. Clearly, this represents both an opportunity to market sport heritage to international visitors, but also demonstrates that sport heritage can be a deeply emotional topic at a local level, and there may be local resistance to broad, touristic commodification of team and sport heritages. Hinch and Higham (2005) position sport tourism as a particularly authentic cultural experience, in part, because of its resistance to commodification. By emphasizing the heritage attributes of a particular sporting place, practice, or experience, authenticity could clearly be part of the sport heritage experience, though its over-emphasis and explicit commodification could transform something special into just another tourism product (Ramshaw, 2014b) while also alienating local supporters.

Over and above the obvious implications of incorporating heritage studies within the field of sport tourism, there are specific, yet relatively neglected topics that heritage sheds light on. Much of the sport tourism literature focuses on travelling to watch a specific team, to attend a particular event, or to take part in a favoured sport whilst vacationing. Fewer studies, with the exception of Higham and Hinch (2009), explore the phenomenon of experiencing sport as a form of cultural consumption. The idea of *Sport as Heritage* (discussed earlier) illustrates this important facet of sport tourism very effectively. Keeping with the consumptive aspects of sport tourism, the *goods and services* category raises another (often neglected) side of sport tourism; namely the significant secondary spend that takes place in and around many sports sites. To what extent such merchandise and collectables can be considered as sport tourism products needs to be explored further, as do the financial implications that such spending generates. Furthermore, the behavioural practices of buying (see Tosun, Temizkan, Timothy, & Fyall, 2007) and, in some cases, collecting (see Pearce, 2009) needs to be explored and understood more. As a result, future research should consider not only the emotional (if any) responses that such purchases generate, but also the salient motivational factors that influence the purchases (Chen & Chen, 2010).

Unquestionably, much ink has been spilt over the motivational aspects that determine sport tourist decisions and behaviour, but the majority of studies have tended to focus on either event attendees or those actively involved in sport whilst on vacation. Using a heritage lens reveals the special connection that visitors have with the important related objects that sport(s) help produce. Whether it be gazing upon the various paraphernalia and relics found in sports museums, halls of fame, or attending stadium tours or visiting other special sites of sporting significance (Gammon, 2004), the heritage of sport reveals quite distinct sport tourism behaviours and experiences. It may be that such visits are rarely the primary purpose of the trip, but this should not detract from the deeply meaningful experiences that such heritage encounters can bring (Gammon, Ramshaw, & Waterton, 2014; Mason, Duquette, & Scherer, 2005; Ramshaw & Hinch, 2006; Snyder, 1991; Wood, 2005). Adopting a heritage focus can also reveal additional dimensions to the more frequently covered sport tourism activities outlined above. For example, the growth of heritage-based events (Ramshaw & Hinch, 2006) reveals the significance of authenticity and remembrance that more regular sports events would rarely imbue. Similarly, to actively engage in sport heritage activities (Wood, 2005) emphasizes the performative elements of sport tourism, and raises additional issues connected to history, education, and genuineness.

Finally, a heritage-based approach to sport tourism reinforces the significance of place – not only highlighting the importance and meaning attributed to many sports venues in and of themselves, but also in the places in which these venues are situated. Many places can be designated as the ‘home’ of a sport, team, tradition, or sporting legend, and as a result be considered worthy of visitation. Therefore sport places are made of and surrounded by other places, each of which impacts upon the other (see Gammon, 2015). To what extent heritage influences the relationships and transactions that occur within and between these places undoubtedly requires further exploration.

## Conclusion

Although heritage is a relatively new component to the sport tourism landscape, its influence has been steadily growing over the last decade. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that both sport and sport-related tourism have begun to penetrate studies in heritage as well as gain representation at more traditional heritage sites, such as historic properties and museums, illustrating some positive cross-fertilization. However, as much as sport represents serious manifestations of heritage it has yet to gain universal acceptance, perhaps illustrating Smith's (2006) idea of the authorized heritage discourse. The purpose of our original paper was to map out the key components in sport-related heritage as a means to drive specific research initiatives. However, it may now be timely to follow recent developments in heritage studies and take a more critical turn in this developing component of sport tourism.

The results of adopting a heritage lens to the field of sport tourism are many and varied – though perhaps one of the key implications is that it draws attention away from the action on the field of play. Tourists are now attracted to visiting the venues, experiencing important sport places as well as seeing the precious artefacts found in halls of fame and sport museums. This is not to ignore the critical part sport events play in promoting and affirming local and national heritage – but only to highlight that the popularity of sport generates interest in the people, places, objects, and practices that are an integral part of it. Though it seems likely that there is a synergistic element between sport heritage experience and broader forms of sport and sport tourism consumption, such as attracting new fans and retaining existing supporters, this connection remains relatively unexplored. Sport heritages are not benign, and can be vehicles for many social, political, and economic initiatives that have both positive and negative outcomes – both for sport tourism and outside of our field. Beyond the idea of simply recognizing that heritage is a part of sport tourism, we must now understand more about how it works.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## References

- "About Us". (2016). *Sport in museums network*. Retrieved September 1, 2016, from <http://www.sportinmuseums.org.uk/content/about/about-us>
- Bagnall, G. (2003). Performance and performativity at heritage sites. *Museum and Society*, 1(2), 87–103.
- Bairner, A. (2015). The Stockholm and Helsinki Olympic stadia as living memorials. In R. Holt & D. Ruta (Eds.), *Routledge handbooks of sport and legacy* (pp. 120–130). London: Routledge.
- Baum, T., & Butler, R. (2014). *Tourism and cricket*. Bristol: Channel View.
- Burdsey, D. (2006). 'If I ever play football, dad, can I play for England or India?' British Asians, sport and diasporic national identities. *Sociology*, 40(1), 11–28.
- Chen, C-F, & Chen, F-S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31, 29–35.
- Derom, I., VanWynsberghe, R., & Scheerder, J. (2015). Maintaining physical activity post-event? Case of the tour of Flanders Cyclo in Belgium. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 18(1), 25–47.

- Finucane, M. (2012, March 7). Fenway Park added to national register of historic places. *Boston Globe*. Retrieved September 1, 2016, from <https://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2012/03/07/fenway-park-listed-national-register-historic-places/rRpZL0g8tLBCsdIIDKXsIM/story.html>
- Fletcher, T. (2012). Who do “they” cheer for? Cricket, diaspora, hybridity and divided loyalties amongst British Asians. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 47(5), 612–631.
- Foer, F. (2005). *How soccer explains the world: An unlikely theory of globalization*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Friedman, M. (2007). The spectacle of the past: Leveraging history in Fenway Park and Camden Yards. In S. Gammon & G. Ramshaw (Eds.), *Heritage, sport and tourism: Sporting pasts–tourist futures* (pp. 103–122). London: Routledge.
- Gammon, S. (2004). Secular pilgrimage and sport tourism. In B. Ritchie and D. Adair (Eds.), *Sport tourism: Interrelationships, impacts and issues* (pp. 30–45). Clevedon: Channel View.
- Gammon, S. (2007). Introduction: Sport, heritage and the English. An opportunity missed? In S. Gammon & G. Ramshaw (Eds.), *Heritage, sport and tourism: Sporting pasts – tourist futures* (pp. 1–9). London: Routledge.
- Gammon, S. (2011). “Sporting” new attractions? The commodification of the sleeping stadium’. In R. Sharpley & P. Stone (Eds.), *Tourism experiences: Contemporary perspectives* (pp. 115–126). London: Routledge.
- Gammon, S. (2014). Heroes as heritage: The commoditization of sporting achievement. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(3), 246–256.
- Gammon, S. (2015). Sport tourism finding its place? In S. Gammon & S. Elkington (Eds.), *Landscapes of leisure: Space, place and identities* (pp. 110–122). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gammon, S., & Ramshaw, G. (2013). Nostalgia and sport. In A. Fyall & B. Garrod (Eds.), *Contemporary cases in sport* (pp. 201–219). London: Goodfellow.
- Gammon, S., Ramshaw, G. & Waterton, E. (2013). Examining the Olympics: Heritage, identity and performance. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(2), 119–124.
- Gammon, S., Ramshaw, G., & Waterton, E. (Eds.) (2014). *Heritage and the Olympics: People, place and performance*. London: Routledge.
- Gibson, H. J. (1998) Sport tourism: A critical analysis of research. *Sport Management Review*, 1(1), 45–76.
- Gordon, K. O. (2013). Emotion and memory in nostalgia sport tourism: Examining the attraction to postmodern ballparks through an interdisciplinary lens. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 18(3), 217–239.
- Graham, B., Ashworth, G. J., & Tunbridge, J. E. (2000). *A geography of heritage: Power, culture & economy*. London: Arnold.
- Harrison, R. (2013). *Heritage: Critical approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Hewison, R. (1989). Heritage: An interpretation. In D. Uzzel (Ed.), *Heritage interpretation volume 1: The natural & built environment* (pp. 15–23). London: Belhaven Press.
- Higham, J., & Hinch, T. (2009). *Sport and tourism: Globalization, mobility and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Hill, J., Moore, K. & Wood, J. (Eds.) (2012). *Sport, history, and heritage*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.
- Hinch, T., & Higham, J. (2005). Sport, tourism and authenticity. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 5(3), 243–256.
- Hinch, T., & Higham, J. (2011). *Sport tourism development*. Bristol: Channel View.
- Hinch, T. & Ramshaw, G. (2014). Heritage sport tourism in Canada. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(2), 237–251.
- Intangible Cultural Heritage. (2016, July 11). Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/>
- Johnson, J. E., Giannoulakis, C., Tracy, D. R., & Ridley, M. J. (2015). An examination of institutional characteristics, selection committees, and induction criteria for college athletic halls of fame. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 11(4), 1–15.
- Joseph, J. (2011). A diaspora approach to sport tourism. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 35(2), 146–167.
- Kellett, P. (2015). Sport museums: Marketing to engage consumers in sport heritage. In R. Rentschler & A. M. Hede (Eds.), *Museum marketing* (pp. 104–113). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Macgowan, A. (2015, September 10). *Overseas football fans visiting Britain now at 800,000*. Retrieved September 2, 2016, from <http://www.bbc.com/sport/football/34197370>
- MacInnes, P. (2016, September 11). *West ham feeling far from home after London stadium teething problems*. Retrieved October 20, 2016, from <https://www.theguardian.com/football/blog/2016/sep/11/west-ham-london-stadium-upton-park>
- Mason, D. S., Duquette, G. H., & Scherer, J. (2005). Heritage, sport tourism and Canadian junior hockey: Nostalgia for social experience or sport place? *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 10(4), 253–271.
- Moore, K. (2012). Sport in museums and museums of sport: An overview. In J. Hill, K. Moore, & J. Wood (Eds.), *Sport, history, and heritage: Studies in public representation* (pp. 93–106). Suffolk: The Boydell Press.
- Moore, R., Richardson, M. & Corkill, C. (2014). Identity in the 'road racing capital of the world': Heritage, geography, and contested spaces. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(3), 228–245.
- National Register of Historic Places. (2012). *Registration form for Fenway Park*. Retrieved September 1, 2016, from <https://www.nps.gov/nr/feature/highlight/fenwaypark/FenwayPark.pdf>
- Pearce, S. M. (2009). *Collecting in contemporary practice*. London: Sage.
- Pfleegor, A. G., Seifriend, C. S. & Soebbing, B. P. (2013). The moral obligation to preserve heritage through sport and recreation facilities. *Sport Management Review*, 16(3), 378–387.
- Phillips, M. G. (Ed.). (2012). *Representing the sporting past in museums and halls of fame*. London: Routledge.
- Phillips, M. G., Osmond, G., & Morgan, S. (2014). Indigenous sport and heritage: Cherbourg's ration shed museum. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(3), 212–227.
- Pinson, J. (2016). Heritage sporting events in territorial development. In M. D. Alvarez, F. M. Go, & A. Yüksel (Eds.), *Heritage tourism destinations: Preservation, communication and development* (pp. 76–90). Wallingford, CT: CABI.
- Ramshaw, G. (2010). Living heritage and the sports museum: Athletes, legacy and the Olympic hall of fame and museum, Canada Olympic Park. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 15(1), 45–70.
- Ramshaw, G. (2014a). A Canterbury tale: Imaginative genealogies and existential heritage tourism at the St. Lawrence ground. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(3), 257–269.
- Ramshaw, G. (2014b). Too much nostalgia? A decennial reflection on the heritage classic ice hockey event. *Event Management*, 18(4), 473–477.
- Ramshaw, G. (2017). Subaltern sport heritages. In B. Onciul, M.L. Stefano & S. Hawke (Eds.), *Engaging heritage, engaging communities* (pp. 179–187). Martlesham: Boydell & Brewer.
- Ramshaw, G. & Gammon, S. (2005). More than just Nostalgia? Exploring the heritage/sport tourism nexus. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 10(4), 229–241.
- Ramshaw, G. & Gammon, S. (2010). On home ground? Twickenham stadium tours and the construction of sport heritage. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 5(2), 87–102.
- Ramshaw, G., Gammon, S., & Huang, W. (2013). Acquired pasts and the commodification of borrowed heritage: The case of the bank of America stadium tour. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 18(1), 17–31.
- Ramshaw, G. & Hinch, T. (2006). Place identity and sport tourism: The case of the heritage classic ice hockey event. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(4&5), 399–418.
- Redmond, G. (1973). A plethora of shrines: Sport in the museum and hall of fame. *Quest*, 19, 41–48.
- Rehling, N. (2011) 'It's about belonging': Masculinity, collectivity, and community in British hooligan films. *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 39(4), 162–173.
- Roberts, L. (2014). Talkin bout my generation: Popular music and the culture of heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 20(3), 262–280.
- Shea, S. (2014). *Wrigley field: The long life and contentious times of the friendly confines*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Snyder, E. (1991). Sociology of nostalgia: Sport halls of fame and museums in America. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8, 228–238.
- Stride, C., Thomas, F., & Ramshaw, G. (2015). Standing out from the crowd: Imaging baseball fans through sculpture. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 32(14), 1611–1638.
- Stride, C., Wilson, J. P., & Thomas, F. (2013). Honouring heroes by branding in bronze: Theorizing the UK's football statuary. *Sport in Society*, 16(6), 749–771.

- Strohmayer, U. (2013). Non-events and their legacies: Parisian heritage and the Olympics that never were. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(2), 186–202.
- Theme 2016. (2016, April 18). Retrieved September 1, 2016, from <http://www.icomos.org/en/what-we-do/image-what-we-do/4746-18-april-theme-2016>
- Timothy, D. J. (1997). Tourism and the personal heritage experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 751–754.
- Timothy, D. J. (2011). *Cultural heritage and tourism*. Bristol: Channel View.
- Tosun, C., Temizkan, P., Timothy, D., & Fyall, A. (2007). Tourist shopping experiences and satisfaction. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9, 87–102.
- Trumbour, R. C., & Womack, K. (2016). *The eighth wonder of the world: The life of Houston's iconic astrodome*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ulvnes, A. M., & Solberg, H. A. (2016). Can major sport events attract tourists? A study of media information and explicit memory. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 16(2), 143–157.
- Wann, D. L., Melnick, M. J., Russell, G. W., & Pease, D. G. (2001). *Sport fans: The psychology and social impact of spectators*. London: Routledge.
- Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (Eds.). (2015). *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research* (pp. 248–257). London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Weed, M. (2005). Sports tourism theory and method – Concepts, issues and epistemologies. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 5(3), 229–242.
- Weed, M., & Bull, C. (2012). *Sports tourism: Participants, policy and providers*. London: Routledge.
- Wilson, R. (2014). It still goes on: Football and the heritage of the Great War in Britain. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(3), 197–211.
- Wood, J. (2005). Olympic opportunity: Realizing the value of sports heritage for tourism in the UK. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 10(4), 307–321.
- Wood, J., & Gabie, N. (2011). The football ground and visual culture: Recapturing place, memory and meaning at Ayresome Park. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 28(8–9), 1186–1202.
- Wright, R. W. (2012). Stadia, identity and belonging: Stirring the sleeping giants of sports tourism. In R. Shipway & A. Fyall (Eds.), *International sports events* (pp. 195–207). London: Routledge.