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SUMMARY

In tourism theory and practice two key traveling motives are business and leisure. Furthermore, it is a known fact that tourist’s satisfaction with consumed tourism service(s) plays a crucial role in forming a long-term relationship on destination-consumer and destination-target market relations. Adding to it a known fact that attracting tourists to a destination for the first time is much harder and more expensive than motivating satisfied guests for repeated visit, the importance of satisfies visitors for a long term destination success and competitiveness is obvious. These arguments have lead to posing a following research question: to what extent does the satisfaction of business visitors with the destination’s tourism offer lead to their return as leisure visitors and to their willingness to spread a positive “word-of-mouth” about the destination. The relations between these concepts are discusses theoretically, examining the existing literature/research and verified empirically through a research conducted on two scientific conferences held in Split.

1. INTRODUCTION
Even though in last few decades Croatia had a predominant sun, sea & sand destination reputation, in recent years strong efforts have been made in transforming that image by developing new forms of tourism, such as business tourism (Petrić, 2013). Last few years, many hotels have been built, and a lot of capital invested in building and development of new congress capacities. That has transformed Croatian traditional summer destinations like Opatija and Dubrovnik to new congress centers in Mediterranean (HGK, 2013).

The importance of all types of businesses meetings and MICE industry in today’s Croatian tourism is evident from figures on number and types of events and visitors in the period from 2010 to 2012 presented in Table 1. These data show a significant growth in number of organized business meetings and total number of business visitors. According to them, in 2010 Republic of Croatia hosted 4.820 business meetings and that number increased to 5.415 in 2011 and to 6.755 in 2012. The number of 6.755 business meetings in 2012 includes 3.201 congress, 3.120 business meetings, 198 incentive trips, and 236 team buildings (HTZ, 2013). These events have hosted more than a million visitors in last three years. To be exact, 394.895 business visitors were recorded in 2010, 405.727 in 2011, and 2012 was a record year with 491.573 business visitors (HTZ, 2012, 2013). These data show a notable progress in development of MICE industry and branding Croatia as a congress destination.

---- Insert Table 2 here ----

For international comparison and assessment of regional and global competitive position, the data published by ICCA¹ are taken. This Association collects and publishes data on international meetings which qualify as such according to association’s internally defined parameters². According to ICCA statistical data, Republic of Croatia had 72 organized business meetings of international importance in 2011 and was ranked as 21st out of 44 listed European countries and 39th in the worldwide ranking (ICCA, 2012). In 2012th, the number of organized business meetings of international importance in Croatia slightly increased (74 business meetings ) while the country’s ranking slightly decreased placing it as 22nd in Europe, and 40th in the world (ICCA, 2013). If Republic of Croatia’s ranking is compared to that of its major competitive destinations like Spain, France, Italy, Greece and Turkey, it ends up on the last place in terms of number of organized business meetings (ICCA, 212).

¹International Congress and Convention Association
²These are available at http://www.iccaworld.com/npps/
conclusion to be drawn is that there is a need and space for progress in this specific and important tourism form.

Most forms of business meetings present type of tourism events. Wisely planned and delivered congresses, conferences, business meetings and team buildings bring many benefits to destinations (Pivčević, 2012). For that reason many hotels have invested in developing MICE industry facilities so today they present a standard offer of large scale and a significant competitive advantage of small scale hotels. Rapid growth of number of meetings business events organized in tourist destinations i.e. outside the organizing companies has contributed to the development of MICE industry (ICCA, 2012). Development of any form of tourism in a destination requires infrastructure and supra structure of adequate quality (Petrič, 2011). Congress participants are considered as demanding guests which in addition to quality basic services require additional services and facilities (Geić, 2011). These participants are mostly highly educated, highly ranked in their organizations, have high income and mostly travelling at the expense of their employer. These features make it very important to pay special attention to their satisfaction with the event and destination visited since it will have a strong impact on their decision to eventually return to destination with their families (Sogar and Jones, 1993).

For these reasons, this paper aims at theoretical and empirical investigation of interrelationship between the tourist’s satisfaction with tourism offer, the intention to return to destination and the spread “word-of-mouth” about the destination. In the empirical part of the paper, results of research conducted in Split during two international conferences are presented. The aim is to determinate the relationship between the conference visitors’ opinion about the destination tourism offer (Split) and the intention to revisit the destination, and to spread a word of mouth.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the beginning of modern tourism, business travelers presented an interesting and important market segment. Namely, business travelers present a pioneer segment of travelers and many suppliers in the tourism industry have tailored their products to fulfill their needs (Kasavana, 2013). Main reasons for this market’s appeal lie in the fact that business people mostly travel several times during the year and prefer upscale luxury accommodation. These elements are the impulse to investigate their needs and elements of destination offer they
consider most important, and which can play crucial role in shaping their decision to return to destination for leisure reasons.

Visitor satisfaction with services consumed in destination plays a major role in developing longstanding relationship between destination and targeted visitor market (His-Jui Wu, 2007). For that reason, the analysis of visitor satisfaction and identification of factors that influence it are the subject of many scientific papers. Williams and Soutar (2009) acknowledge the importance of value for money, and emotional and innovative value of service, as factors which can strongly influence satisfaction or dissatisfaction of travelers with destinations offer and thus reflect upon their future decision to return to tourist destination. Rodriguez del Basque and San Martin (2008) have identified the existence of several major paradigms used in social science for analyzing and interpreting visitor behavior. Two most frequently used approaches to analyze decision making process and visitor satisfaction with tourist service are cognitive and emotional one. Cognitive approach focuses on confirmation or disconfirmation of traveler’s expectations (Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Bolton and Drew, 1991; Boulding, et al., 1993 according to Williams and Soutar, 2009). Emotional approach, on the other hand, is based upon the assumption that feelings are the most important component of tourism experience, since a journey to a tourist destination, no matter reasons, includes rest, relaxation, and runaway from everyday life (Decrop, 1999 according to Rodriguez del Basque and San Martin, 2008). Woodruff et al. (1983) argue that visitor satisfaction with consumed service should be defined in a way that reflects the connection between cognitive and emotional processes, since satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction are strongly connected with fulfillment of needs.

Visitor satisfaction is directly connected with visitors’ loyalty. Existing research indicates higher propensity to consume and become loyal for visitors who were very satisfied with facilities in destination (Križman Pavlović, 2008). Namely, of all the visitors who are satisfied with a tourism product, only a small number will return to destination, and even smaller number of these, called repeaters, will become loyal destination customers. The complexity of the notion of visitor satisfaction in tourism results from the complexity of destination product, which is in fact a combination of services/outputs of multiple providers. Having this complexity and heterogeneity of destination tourism product in mind, the difficulty of assuring adequate quality and consistency of all partial elements of that product becomes apparent. Several conducted studies (Anderson and Sullivan, 1990; Cronin and Taylor, 1994; Patterson and Spreng, 1997), indicate the existence of a positive correlation
between the visitors’ satisfaction with tourist product and intention of re-consumption and return to tourism destination (Williams and Soutar, 2009). Boulding et al. (1993, according to Williams and Soutar, 2009), have determined a positive correlation between the visitors’ perception of quality of tourism service and their intention of returning to tourism destination and passing on their recommendation to their friends and acquaintances. This is extremely important since tourist product is in fact an experience that can most easily be described and passed on by personal communication. Therefore, “word of mouth” is considered to be the best and most reliable source of information in tourism. Special attention should be given to this type of promotion since it can be of positive and negative nature. Mihić (2011) argues that according to some research a satisfied customer passes on his positive experience to three persons while the unsatisfied one shares his negative with nine to eleven people while other research suggests that these figures are even higher - eight for satisfied customer compared to 22 persons for an unsatisfied one. Development of modern information technologies and social networks has simplified the process of transferring satisfaction and dissatisfaction within population, but has also opened new channels of communication for tourism service providers. Now, easier and faster than ever before, they can respond to and solve different issues/problems guests face while on holiday. Proactive personal relations and fast solving of all potential “situations” that can negatively affect visitors’ experience and satisfaction is extremely important in this manner. For instance, a research suggests that hotel managers are not familiar with 96% of all unsatisfied guests while at the same time, solving the problem and dealing with complain fast and effectively will in 95% of cases result in guest’s repeated visit (Albrecht and Zemke, 1985 according to Bardi, 2003).

Results of a research conducted by Hosanya and Prayaga (2013), confirms the thesis that visitor satisfaction with tourist destination offer creates a long lasting bond between them. By adapting Hosany and Gillberts (2010) scale for measuring visitor satisfaction with tourist experience in destination, authors have concluded that visitors which were enthusiastic and passionate about their tourism experience have created a positive emotional bond with the destination (Hosany and Prayag, 2013). Development of such type of tourism products builds core competitive advantage for destinations on tourism market, and influences significantly their recognition on international level (Kozak and Rimmington, 1999).

Development of internationally recognizable image and competitiveness of a tourism destination is a long lasting and complex process. It requires involvement of all major destination stakeholders and introduction and implementation of strategic development and
marketing measures. A necessary ingredient is the cooperation between destination marketing organization and public sector entities in defining fundamental goals and measures of tourism development and in attracting capital and investments (Pike and Page, 2014). Meta-analysis of the existing research on relationship between the destination image and visitor loyalty with (Hongmei et al. 2014; Geng-Qing Chi and Qu, 2007) has proved significant influence of destination image on visitor loyalty. It was determined that the overall image of tourist destination has a stronger influence on visitor loyalty than emotional or cognitive image (Zhang, et al. 2014). This is also highly valuable insight for destination that plan on becoming congress destinations.

Competitiveness and comparative advantages of destinations are keys for success on tourism market and the growth of market share. Therefore, the tasks of tourism managers is to identify and explore the most important comparative advantages of destination and to analyze its market position with the aim of developing the adequate forms of tourism, in this case congress tourism. The complexity of this mission can be demonstrated by the integrated model developed by Dwyer et al. (2003) which includes 85 different indicators to measure competitiveness of tourism destinations (Omerzel Gomezelj, Mihalič, 2007). The catch is that there is no universal set of indicators for all destinations, but each destination needs to adapt it to its particularities. It additionally emphasizes the complexity of process of building competitiveness and image of a tourism destination.

If a destination aims at becoming a congress center on regional and national level and expects to achieve a temporal redistribution of demand on this account, the image of congress destination needs to be worked upon. It needs to be based upon significant investments in infrastructure and additional facilities this kind of guests require. Attracting congresses and transforming congress visitors into repeat visitors is of vital significance in this process. Main reasons are their higher level of personal income and higher payment capabilities. These arguments are supported by many cases/destinations worldwide. For example, the analysis of tourism development impacts in the United States of America revealed that in 2012 business tourism has generated 258.6 billions of dollars of direct tourism consumption, 39.8 billions of tax income and 2.2 millions of jobs, (U.S. Travel Association, 2013).

3. EMPIRICAL RESEARCH
The empirical research for this paper was conducted among the visitors of two scientific conferences held in Split in 2013. The first is „Challenges of Europe“, organized by the
Faculty of Economics Split (later on referred to as Conference 1) and the second is Fifth international conference on marine science organized by the Marine faculty of Split in cooperation with Marine Faculty of Kotor, Montenegro and Portorož, Slovenia (later on referred to as Conference 2).

The research on Conference 1 was conducted using the online questionnaire and after two rounds of contacting was answered by 24 participants. The research on Conference 2 was conducted on site and 39 completed questionnaires were collected. The socio-demographic profile of visitors is presented in Table 2.

Data show that on both conferences male prevail with a little higher share on Conference 1. Most of the participants are in the age group of 31-55 while by the education level Conference 1 is dominated by PhD title holders and Conference 2 by Master title holders. These high levels of education are logical and expected for scientific conferences. Figure 1 shows the main motives for participating in the conferences.

Results show that participant of Conference 1 name professional development (62.50%) while the participants of Conference 2 name their personal development (43.59%). Participants of Conference 1 put the quality of conference/conference themes on second place while Conference 2 participants put that motive on the 3rd place. From this paper’s topic point of view the most important motive to consider is “the location of conference”. The results show that for the participants of Conference 1 it is a relatively important motive (listed by 20.83% participants) while at the same time it is rather less important for the participants of Conference 2 (listed by 7.69% participants). A possible reason for these discrepancies might be the number of previous visits to Split exhibited in Figure 2.3

As the data show, a significant proportion of respondents from both conferences visited Split three and more times. This is especially prevalent for Conference 1 participants since more than 80% of them belong to this group of repeated visitors. On the other hand, on Conference 2 that share is almost halved but still respectable (44.83%). Also, 20% of Conference 2

3 In the analysis of all questions that follow, respondents that live in Split are left out
participants were in Split once before and the same share visited Split twice. The share of respondents which never visited Split before is relatively low on both conferences and especially on Conference 2.

The question on planned length of stay was also asked. Most of the respondents intend to stay in Split for 3 days – a little over 30% of those on Conference 1 and a little over 40% on Conference 2. Following are participants that intend to stay 2 days follow (Conference 1) and those that will stay four days (Conference 2). The share of respondents intending to stay 5 and more days is relatively low – cca 20% on Conference 1 and cca 10% on Conference 2.

The respondents’ grading of Split tourism offer (Figure 3) shows that most of the Conference 1 participants graded it as very good (66.7 % of them) and excellent (30.43% of them). The Conference 2 participants were somewhat more critical in this manner as they gave the same proportion of grade very good and good (34.5%) and a slightly higher share of grade excellent (31.03%) to Split tourism offer. It is noteworthy stressing a very positive outcome that none of the respondents from both Conferences graded the town’s tourist offer with low grades (insufficient and sufficient).

As far as the intention to revisit is concerned (Figure 4), the results show that none of the respondents in both samples i.e. both conferences did not state that they will not come to Split again. On the contrary, the highest share of respondents on both Conferences stated that they will definitely visit Split again (788.26% from Conference 1 and 62.07% from Conference 2) and a significant share said that they will probably visit again (21.74% on Conference 1 and 34.48% on Conference 2).

To investigate the relationship between the satisfaction of participants with Split tourism offer and the intention to revisit the destination, Spearman’s correlation coefficient was used (Table 3).

The correlation coefficient for this relationship on Conference 1 is 0.229 demonstrating that between these variables there is a positive, weak correlation. However, the empirical significance level ($\alpha^* = 0.294$) shows that the correlation is not statistically significant.
Therefore, it can be concluded that the respondents will come back to Split but statistically, the reason for their return is not their grade of town tourism offer.

The same relationship was tested on Conference 2 respondents. The correlation coefficient here is 0.218 meaning that between the variables there is a positive, weak correlation. On the other hand, the empirical significance level of correlation coefficient ($\alpha^*$ = 0.256) shows that here also the relationship is not statistically significant. So, the Conference 2 participants as well it has been revealed that they will come back to Split but the reason for it is not the grade they grade the town’s tourism offer.

Through the research it was also investigated if the respondents will engage in “word of mouth” about the destination (Figure 5)

---- Insert Figure 5 here ----

The results show that most of the respondents say they will definitely recommend a visit to Split to their friends and acquaintances – 78.26% of Conference 1 and 62.07% of Conference 2 participants. Following are those that will probably recommend visiting Split – around 20% on both conferences. In this matter also the Conference 2 respondents are more critical. Namely, all of the respondents of Conference 1 fall into previous two groups i.e. they will definitely or probably recommend while 10% of Conference 2 participants are indecisive (not sure if they will recommend or not) and 3.45% probably will not recommend.

To investigate the relationship between the satisfaction of participants with Split tourism offer and the intention to recommend a visit to Split to friends and acquaintances, Spearman’s correlation coefficient was also used (Table 4).

---- Insert Table 4 here ----

The correlation coefficient Conference 1 is 0.438, meaning that between the variables a positive, medium strong relationship exists. Since the empirical significance level is $\alpha^*$ = 0.036, the relationship is statistically significant so it can be concluded that as a result of the satisfaction (grade) of Split tourism offer the participants will spread a positive “word of mouth” about the destination.

The same testing for Conference 2 gave different results. The correlation coefficient is 0.087 showing a positive but very weak correlation which is not statistically significant ($\alpha^*$ = 0.239). Therefore, the conclusion is that although the respondents graded Split tourism offer as
positive and with relatively good/high grades, statistically that will not be the reason for which they will spread a positive “word of mouth” about visiting Split.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The conducted empirical research has given some interesting and new insights on congress visitors. Firstly, it was revealed that the destination of conference is not an insignificant factor in deciding on attending a conference but also that this motive differs significantly among conferences under investigation. For Conference 1, it was the 3rd motive by importance (20%) and on the Conference 2 4th with only 7.69% share. Since a large proportion of both conference respondents has already visited Split three and more times, this result comes as no big surprise. To the contrary, what is surprising is the fact that over 80% of Conference 1 (i.e. 86.96% of them) was in Split for three and more times while still one fifth of them names the conference destination as a reason for attending. That leads to a presumption that this segment contains visitors loyal to destination but on the other hand the reason can be their loyalty to conference, organizer, partner institution etc. Since these aspects were not covered in questionnaire, this presumption cannot be confirmed empirically.

The results regarding the Split tourism offer grade give grounds for relative satisfaction since the grades of both groups of respondents’ average as very good while low grades are not recorded at all. Therefore, it is not surprising that most part of respondents will definitely come back to destination followed by those that probably will come while respondents that probably and/or definitely will not come back are not found. However, the statistical analysis performed showed that there is no statistically significant relationship between the tourism offer grade and the intention to revisit. That shows that this high level of revisit intention is not induced by the satisfaction with tourism offer but by some other reason(s). However, since the questionnaire did not include questions that would reveal these aspects, these reasons can only be guessed upon. For that reason, coverage of these aspects is a recommendation for further research in this area.

Similar results have been recorded for spreading the “word of mouth”. Namely, although more than a half of both conference respondents have stated that they will definitely recommend a visit to Split to their friends and acquaintances and a significant share that they probably will recommend, the statistical analysis showed for Conference 1 this is statistically positively correlated with the grade of tourism offer while for the Conference 2 not. Having in mind that a high share of Conference 1 respondents has already visited Split for three and
more times, a possible conclusion is that these repeated visits i.e. loyal visitors are a potential cause. However, due to a small sample size, more detailed statistical analysis that would confirm or reject this conclusion is not possible. Also, since no additional questions covering other possible reason for this were given in the questionnaire, they can now only be guessed upon.

This research, as any other, has its limitations. Besides the above-mentioned limitations concerning the absence of some aspect/questions in the questionnaire, the most important limitation of this research is the sample size and the number of conferences investigated. For these reasons, the findings presented need to be taken as indicative only and serve as an impulse and starting point for further research with wider base of events/conferences and respondents. Also, the research variables and questionnaire could be improved and expanded.
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Tablica 1. Ukupan broj poslovnih skupova i njihovi sudionik u Hrvatskoj u periodu 2010-12 /Total number of business events and their participants in Croatia in period 2010-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Godina</th>
<th>Broj poslovnih skupova</th>
<th>Sudionici ukupno</th>
<th>Indeks broja poslovnih skupova</th>
<th>Indeks sudionika ukupno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of business events</td>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>Index of business events</td>
<td>Index of participants number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010.</td>
<td>4.820</td>
<td>394,895</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011.</td>
<td>5.415</td>
<td>405,727</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012.</td>
<td>6.755</td>
<td>491,573</td>
<td>124.75</td>
<td>121,16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Izvor: Vlastiti prikaz prema HTZ, 2012 i 2013
Source: Authors' elaboration according to data from HTZ, 2012 and 2013

Tablica 2: Profil ispitanika / The respondents' profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBLJEŽJE</th>
<th>Konferencija 1/Conference 1</th>
<th>Konferencija 2/Conference 2</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frekvencija Frequency %</td>
<td>Frekvencija Frequency %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOL</td>
<td>Ženski</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muški</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>do 30 godina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-55 godina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>više od 55 godina</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUPANJ OBRAZOVANJA</td>
<td>Završena srednja škola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Završen fakultet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Završen magistarski studij</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Završen doktorski studij</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Izvor: istraživanje autora
Source: Authors' research

Grafikon 1. Razlog sudjelovanja u konferenciji / The reason for attending the conference

Izvor: istraživanje autora
Source: Authors' research
Grafikon 2. Broj prethodnih posjeta Splitu / The number of times you visited Split so far

Izvor: istraživanje autora
Source: Authors’ research

Grafikon 3. Kako ocjenjujete turističku ponudu grada Splita?/How would you grade Split tourism offer?

Izvor: istraživanje autora
Source: Authors’ research
**Grafikon 4. Da li ćete ponovno doći u Split?/ Will you visit Split again?**

![Grafikon 4](image)

**Tablica 3: Spearmanov koeficijent korelacije za vezu ocjene turističke ponude grada Splita i namjere ponovnog povrata/ Spearman's correlation coefficient for the relationship between the grade of Split tourism offer and the intention to revisit Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Konferencija 1 / Conference 1</th>
<th>Konferencija 2 / Conference 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you</td>
<td>How would you</td>
<td>How would you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess Split's</td>
<td>assess Split's</td>
<td>assess Split's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visit Split</td>
<td>tourist offer?</td>
<td>tourist offer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you visit</td>
<td>Will you visit Split again?</td>
<td>Will you visit Split again?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split again?</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade Split's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourist offer?</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split again?</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Izvor: istraživanje autora**

*Source: Authors' research*
Grafikon 5. Hoćete li preporučiti prijateljima i poznanicima posjet Splitu?/Will you recommend a visit to Split to Your friends and acquaintances?

**Tablica 4: Spearmanov koeficijent korelacije za vezu ocjene turističke ponude grada Splita i namjere preporuke posjeta Splitu prijateljima i poznanicima / Spearman's correlation coefficient for the relationship between the grade of Split tourism offer and the intention to recommend friends and acquaintances to visit Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Konferencija 1</th>
<th>Konferencija 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you assess Split's tourist offer?</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.438(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you suggest to your friends or acquaintances to visit Split?</td>
<td>.438(*)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Izvor: istraživanje autora

*Source: Authors' research*