



Festival motivation and loyalty factors

As motivações dos festivais e os fatores de lealdade

Miranda Kitterlin

Florida International University, Chaplin School of Hospitality and Tourism, Hospitality and Tourism Management Department, 33181, North Miami, USA, mkitterl@fiu.edu

Michelle Yoo

Florida International University, Chaplin School of Hospitality and Tourism, Hospitality and Tourism Management Department, 33181, North Miami, USA, myoo@fiu.edu

Abstract

Every year hundreds of festivals and host communities around the world face increased competition from both each other and from other entertainment options available to the consumer. It is imperative that festival organizers understand tourist motivations for attending festivals in order to conduct effective festival planning and achieve a more productive festival marketing position and marketing strategy. The purpose of this study is twofold: First, this study attempted to investigate whether festivalscape factors impact attendees' motivation and loyalty behavior. Additionally, this study attempted to examine whether festivalscape factors are influenced by different types of attendees. Practical implications for festival organizers and marketers include the importance of the customization of operational and marketing strategies depending on their target market (local versus non-local). Academic contributions of this study pertain to the theoretical foundations by validating the impact of festivalscape factors in tourism marketing.

Keywords: Event management, festival, festivalscape, loyalty, motivation.

Resumo

Todos os anos centenas de festivais e comunidades de acolhimento em todo o mundo veem-se confrontados com uma concorrência crescente tanto entre si como por parte de outras opções de entretenimento disponíveis ao consumidor. É imperioso que os organizadores de festivais compreendam as motivações turísticas para assistir a festivais, de modo a fazerem um planeamento efetivo do festival e conseguirem uma estratégia de marketing e um posicionamento do festival mais produtivos. Este trabalho tem dois objetivos: Em primeiro lugar, investigar se os fatores de *festivalscape* têm impacto nas motivações dos participantes e no comportamento de lealdade. Em segundo lugar, este estudo pretende examinar se os fatores de *festivalscape* são influenciados por diferentes tipos de participantes. As implicações práticas para os organizadores de festivais e *marketers* incluem a importância da personalização das estratégias operacionais e de marketing em função do seu mercado-alvo (local versus não-local). Os contributos académicos deste estudo são ao nível da fundamentação teórica, validando o impacto dos fatores de *festivalscape* em marketing turístico.

Palavras-chave: Gestão de eventos, festivais, *festivalscape*, lealdade, motivação.

1. Introduction

With hundreds of festivals held annually in the United States, these events compete fiercely for visitors, sponsors, and talent. Globally, the festival industry has continued in rapid evolution and development since the 1900s, with consumers around the world dedicating large amounts of time and money to attend these events (Gelder & Robinson, 2009; Lee, Lee, Lee, & Babin, 2008). In order to secure long-term growth and sustainability, it is imperative that festival organizers have an in-depth understanding of the tourist market for their events so that they can be promoted, organized, and managed in a manner that offers patrons value in the experience (Lee, Lee, Lee, & Babin, 2008; Uys, 2003). This is particularly important in the increasingly competitive festival sector of the events industry (Shanka & Taylor, 2004).

Numerous aspects of festival tourism are discussed in the academic literature; a primary area being the examination of motivation for festival attendance (Kruger, Saayman, & Ellis, 2010; Lee & Hsu, 2013; Lee, Lee, & Yoon, 2009; Mosley, Lehto, & Day, 2011; Son & Lee, 2011; Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009). However, limited research has been conducted to investigate repeat visitation specifically, especially in regards to the increasingly popular facet of food and beverage festivals. What studies have been conducted reiterate the importance of understanding repeat visitation behavior, as they differ significantly from first-time visitors, and an understanding of their entire market structure is imperative for festival organization committees to ensure both immediate and long-term success (Chen & Chen, 2010; Correia, Oliveira, & Butler, 2008; Jang & Feng, 2007; Gelder & Robinson, 2009; Kruger, Saayman, & Ellis, 2010; Lee, Lee, Lee,

& Babin, 2008; Lee & Hsu, 2013; Lee, Lee, & Yoon, 2009; Li, Cheng, Kim, & Petrick, 2008; Son & Lee, 2011; Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009; Wang, 2004).

1.1 Significance

Individual festivals and host communities face increased competition, not just from other festivals, but from other entertainment options available to the consumer (Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009). A critical component in tourism marketing, it is imperative that festival organizers understand tourist motivations for attending festivals; without this knowledge the facilitation of effective festival planning is hindered, as is the ability to achieve a more productive festival marketing position and marketing strategy (Bansal & Eiselt, 2004; Fodness, 1994; Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009). A greater understanding of this topic will benefit festival management committees in regards to both short-term momentum and long-term sustainability (Shanka & Taylor, 2004). Specifically, this study explores differences in local versus non-local attendees, as many festivals rely on a mixture of both patron groups. Finally, a greater understanding of attendee motivation may help to adapt current tourism literature to include the potential vagaries of the repeat festival attendee.

2. Objectives

The purpose of this study is twofold: First this study attempted to investigate whether festivalscape factors impact attendees' motivation and loyalty behavior. Additionally, this study attempted to examine whether festivalscape factors are influenced by different types of attendees.

3. Literature review

3.1 Importance of Festivals

It has been said that “festivals are an important expression of human activity that contributes much to our social and cultural life” (Allen, O’Toole, Harris, & McDonnell, 2011, p. 14). These events have become “a pervasive feature of our cultural landscape that constitute a vital and growing component of the event industry” (Allen, O’Toole, Harris, & McDonnell, 2011, p. 14). Other commonly recognized positive outcomes for the community include: provision of economic support, authenticity, and community cohesion (Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009). Festivals may also generate business activity and income for their host communities, as they can directly and indirectly increase tourism revenue (Allen, O’Toole, Harris, & McDonnell, 2011; Loots, I., Ellis, S., & Slabbert, 2011; Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009). These events can be a ‘financial injection’ to their host economies, and one that governments, businesses, and residents rely on (Delamere, Wankel, & Hinch, 2001; Loots, Ellis, & Slabbert, 2011). Saayman (2004) proposed that the contribution of these events to tourism in the area is especially seen in that they offer entertainment and serve as an attraction for their host community. This idea is supported by Prentice and Anderson (2003), who further it by advocating that festivals can be considered destinations in and of themselves.

3.2 Food and Wine Festivals

While many types of festivals are held around the globe, one in particular that has become universally popular is the food and wine festival. These events can range from large festivals in major cities to local festivals showcasing the cuisine of the host regional cuisine (Allen, O’Toole, Harris, & McDonnell, 2011). Representative of this sector is the world-renowned Food Network South Beach Wine & Food Festival (SOBE WFF) Presented by FOOD & WINE. (n.d). Founded in 1997, the SOBE WFF has grown into a four-day event, with attendance growing to over 65,000 guests from around the world. The festival is hosted jointly by Southern Wine & Spirits and Florida International University (FIU), and is designed to showcase “the talents of the world’s most renowned wine and spirits producers, chefs and culinary personalities” (Food Network, n.d.). Proceeds benefit FIU’s Chaplin School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, and have totaled more than \$19 million as of 2013.

3.3 Festivalscape

It has been proposed that attendee satisfaction and reactions are influenced by the festivalscape in which the experience is produced and consumed (Lee, Lee, Lee, & Babin, 2008). In context, the term festivalscape refers to “the general atmosphere experienced by festival patrons” (p. 57). This concept rests on the tenants of environmental psychology theory (Mehrabian & Russel, 1974) and servicescape theory (Bitner, 1990; Bitner, 1992); see Lee, Lee, Lee, & Babin (2008) for further development explanation.

The festivalscape is developed when physical environmental cues combine to create the festival attendee’s perception of the event both functionally and affectively (Darden & Babin, 1994; Lee, Lee, Lee, & Babin, 2008). Previous studies found support for the conclusion that emotion plays an important role in explaining festival attendee outcomes, and demonstrated that attendees judge an event’s festivalscape along seven environmental cues. These seven underlying dimension of festival environment cues are: program content, staff demeanor, facility quality, food perception, souvenir availability and quality, convenience, and

information availability. Further, it was found that these judgments guide attendees’ subsequent emotions and behavioral intentions (Lee, Lee, Lee, & Babin, 2008), and may impact the attendee’s motivation to repeat festival attendance.

3.4 Festival Attendees

Local festivals are increasingly utilized to promote tourism and further boost the local economy (Felsenstein & Fleischer, 2003). While there are different types of customers who attend festivals, previous studies emphasized the difference and importance of local residents and visitors who do not reside locally due to their distinctive behaviors (Bagelym & Mokhtarian, 2002; Felsenstein & Fleischer, 2003; Formica & Uysal, 1996; Liang, Illum, & Cole, 2008). For example, attendees who are local residents are found to have different spending behavior compared to non-locals (Felsenstein & Fleischer, 2003). Moreover, studies indicated distance as an influential factor for traveling motivation, behavioral intention, and the type of activity people participate in (Lentnek, Harwitz, & Narula, 1981; Liang, Illum, & Cole, 2008).

Festival attendees can be grouped into two categories: first-time visitors and repeat visitors (Lau & McKercher, 2004; McKercher & Wong, 2004). First-time visitors are those attendees who have discovered the festival and are experiencing it for the first time, while repeat visitors have already acquired familiarity and satisfaction with the experience (Lau & McKercher, 2004). Both first-time and repeat attendees play a vital role in the success and sustainability of a festival. It has been found that these two groups differ significantly in regards to socio-demographics, behavioral characteristics, destination perception, perceived value, and travel motivations. While first-time attendees have been found to spend a significant amount of money during the festival, repeat visitors have been found to stay longer and spend more – a testament to their loyalty. Thus, this segment of repeat visitors represents an attractive and cost-effective market segment for festivals (Kruger, Saayman, & Ellis, 2010).

3.4 Festival Motivation

Understanding festival motivation is imperative to design offerings for attendees, identify attendees’ decision making process, and ultimately increase satisfaction levels. Individualistic motivations for festivals emerged because of the mixture of recreation for the local residents and tourism offerings for tourists (non-locals) (Crompton & McKay, 1997). Based on previous research, need for excitement, event novelty, unique experience, socialization, entertainment, involvement are some reasons why people attend festivals. However, it should be noted that differences in motivations were revealed across factors such as age, income, local residency, repeat visitation (Crompton & McKay, 1997; Formica & Uysal, 1996; Mohr, Backman, Gahan, & Backman, 1993; Uysal, Gahan, & Martin, 1993).

Pioneered by Gitelson & Crompton (1984), first-time and repeat visitor studies concluded that each group had different motivations, leading to different behavior. Most notable differences proposed by previous researchers included: socio-demographics, behavior characteristics, destination perceptions, satisfaction and image, and travel motivation (Kruger, Saayman, & Ellis, 2010; Lau & McKercher, 2004; McKercher & Wong, 2004; Shanka & Taylor, 2004; Li et al., 2008). Repeat visitors have also been found to display a stronger value-loyalty relationship than first-time festivalgoers (Lee, Lee, & Yoon, 2009).



3.5 Festival Loyalty

Hospitality marketers have directed their attention towards customer loyalty and applied strategies to the tourism context because loyal customers are known to be less price-sensitive, require fewer promotions, and attract new customers through positive word-of-mouth (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978; Oliver, 1999; Opperman, 2000; Petrick, 2004). Numerous studies have found loyalty among tourists to be a useful indicator for accessing overall tourism experience, and that tourism loyalty is representative of future tourist behavior; all of this is influenced by tourism experiences, and can help managers develop appropriate marketing strategies (Lee & Hsu, 2013; Lee, Yoon, & Lee, 2007; Um, Chon, & Ro, 2006). Chen and Chen (2010) advise that experience quality can be created by increasing a visitors' interest and involvement, thus leading to a perception of value and satisfaction; all of this contributes to visitor loyalty.

A recent study by Son and Lee (2011) identified three festival quality factors: general features, comfort amenities, and socialization. While all three festival quality factors were found to have a direct and positive affect on future intentions of recommendation and revisit, the general features factor was found to have the greatest impact on re-visit intention, and included the following festival quality attributes: diversity of activities, entertainment sound system, promotion and information, festival atmosphere, entertainment stages, accessibility, safety and security, and food and beverage. This finding is similar to that of a previous study by Cole and Illum (2006), which also proposed a direct relationship between festival quality and revisit behavior intention.

Loyalty is a multifaceted substance and has been perceived as a three dimensional concept including behavioral, attitudinal, and composite (Backman & Crompton, 1991; Bowen & Chen, 2001). The behavioral perspective measures loyalty as the static outcome of a dynamic process. It focuses primarily on behavioral outcomes and can be assessed through repeat purchase intentions, purchasing behaviors (such as frequency, intensity, proportion), and word-of-mouth recommendations (Baloglu, 2002; Opperman, 2000). The attitudinal approach conceptualizes loyalty as attitudes that are considered as a function of a psychological process (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978). The attitudinal perspective measures loyalty as an affection toward a brand through indicators such as trust, emotional attachment, and commitment (Baloglu, 2002; Bowen & Shoemaker, 2003; Morgan & Hunt, 1994).

Composite loyalty implies that neither the behavioral nor the attitudinal loyalty approach alone describes loyalty fully. Instead it suggests that loyalty should be simultaneously considered from a behavioral and an attitudinal perspective. Namely, a true loyal customer must both purchase the brand and have a positive attitude towards the brand at the same time (Backman & Crompton, 1991; Bowen & Chen, 2001; Dick & Basu, 1994; Petrick, 2004). Thus, this study measured loyalty from an integrated perspective by including both the behavioral and the attitudinal aspects.

3.7 Summary and Research Questions

Myriad studies have concluded with a call for further and ongoing investigation of festival-visitor behavior, especially investigation that uses a rigorous, theoretical approach (Chen & Chen, 2010; Correia, Oliveira, & Butler, 2008; Jang & Feng, 2007; Gelder & Robinson, 2009; Kruger, Saayman, & Ellis, 2010; Lee, Lee, & Babin, 2008; Lee & Hsu, 2013; Lee, Lee, & Yoon, 2009; Li, Cheng, Kim, & Petrick, 2008; Son & Lee, 2011; Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009; Wang, 2004). This call for future research, combined with a review of the relevant

literature and the purpose of the study yielded the development of the following research questions:

1. Do festivalscape factors impact attendees' motivation and loyalty to festivals?
 2. How do festivalscape factors affect attendees' differently?
- Overall, the study hypotheses were derived as following:

H1: Festivalscape affects festival attendees' motivation.

H2: Festivalscape affects festival attendees' loyalty.

H3: Residency (local vs. non-local) has a significant impact on festivalscape factors.

H4: Repeat visitation has a significant impact on festivalscape factors.

4. Methodology

4.1 Data Collection and Study Sample

This study implemented a primary field survey design and developed a questionnaire based on previous research to test the hypotheses. The self-administered survey was divided into several sections. The first part asked participants general behavior questions about the festival such as how they purchased the ticket, how many tickets they purchased, whether it was their first time attending the festival or not, and so on. Respondents were then asked about their level of agreement on why they attended the festival (motivation) and their level of agreement on their loyalty behavior. Next, participants were asked to indicate how likely the festival environment cues affect their return intention. Lastly, demographic information was collected.

The world-renowned Food Network South Beach Wine & Food Festival (SOBE WFF) was held in South Beach Miami, Florida from February 21, 2013 to February 24, 2013. The festival is presented by FOOD & WINE with attendance of over 65,000 guests from around the world. The festival is hosted jointly by Southern Wine & Spirits and Florida International University (FIU), and is designed to showcase "the talents of the world's most renowned wine and spirits producers, chefs and culinary personalities" (Food Network, n.d.). Data was collected on February 23 and 24, 2013 at the Grand Tasting Village event while attendees were waiting in line to enter the event. The Grand Tasting Village event is one of the biggest events at the SOBE WFF, which is held for 2 consecutive days. Overall, a total number of 244 usable questionnaires were used in this study.

4.2 Data Measurement

Measurements of motivation were incorporated from a comprehensive review of tourism motivation literature (Dann, 1981; Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009; Yoon & Uysal, 2005) as the following: unique experience, good value for the money, socialize, celebrity chefs and food network stars, reputation/word-of-mouth, local /close to home, opportunity to relax, spend time with family/friends, entertainment, variety of events, quality of the events, and introduction of new products. The items were selected and modified to apply to the research site and target. Festival loyalty was measured in two dimensions: attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. Attitudinal loyalty was measured through items such as commitment and preference. Behavioral loyalty was measured through items such as willingness to pay more, spread word-of-mouth, recommendation, and return intention. Seven festival environment cues of program content, staff demeanor, facility quality, food perception, souvenir availability and quality, convenience, and information availability from a previous study were implemented to judge an event's festivalscape (Lee, Lee, Lee, & Babin, 2008). Souvenir availability and quality was adjusted and renamed as benefits in this study. A seven point likert

scale, meaning 1 as “strongly disagree” or “not at all likely” to 7 as “strongly agree” or “extremely likely” was used to measure motivation, loyalty, and festivalscape factors.

4.3 Method and Data Analysis

Data was entered and analyzed in SPSS version 20.0. Three steps of data analysis were performed to test the study hypotheses. First, factor analysis was used to condense the large set of variables into a few underlying constructs to easily manage measurement. Factor analysis was performed on motivation items, loyalty items, and festivalscape factors. Next, multiple regression analysis was performed to simply test whether festivalscape factors affect attendees' motivation and loyalty. This was a necessary step to observe if the festivalscape factors had a significant impact so the study could ultimately proceed to the final step to examine the group differences. Regression analysis explains if there is a relationship between two or more variables and it also clarifies whether the relationship is linear as in positive or negative. Assumptions were checked in prior to performing multiple regression analysis. Data were screened for outliers and scatter plots were reviewed of nonlinear distributions and relationships and constant variance. Model summary of Durbin-Watson was checked in each case for the independence of observations. Variance inflation factors (VIF) were checked for multicollinearity by observing any significantly huge values. Regression analysis was run on motivation and loyalty separately as dependent variables and the festivalscape factors as independent variables at a 0.05 alpha level (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006).

Finally, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to determine whether there were differences between independent groups on the dependent variable. Follow-up univariate analysis (ANOVA) was conducted to determine which of the dependent variables contribute to group differences. MANOVA is assumed to be relatively robust but assumptions include normal distribution, linear relationships among all pairs of dependent variables, independence of observation, and homogeneity of the covariance matrices. All assumptions were checked and missing data were removed. Chronbach's alpha test was performed to assess reliability. Variables showed a Chronbach's alpha value over 0.7, indicating sufficient reliability (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006).

5. Results

5.1 Sample Profile

Table 1 shows the sample profile for this study. More than half of the sample was between 40 and 59 years old (54.5%) and approximately 37% were under 40 years old. A large proportion of the sample either had a bachelor's degree (31.7%) or a graduate degree (32.1%). Less than 20% had an associate degree and less than 15% had a highschool diploma. More than half of the sample was Caucasian comprising the largest ethnic group. The second largest ethnic group was the Hispanic, comprising around 30%. The rest, American Indian, African American, Asian or Pacific Islander, and mixed race represented approximately 15%. Numbers that do not add up to the total sample size is due to the fact that some participants refused to answer some of the demographic questions. There were more females (almost 60%), leaving about 40% males. More than 60% of the sample was married, 28.8% were single, and roughly 10% were with a partner. Lastly, nearly 63% were local residents and 37% were non-locals while, roughly 40% were first-time visitors and 60% were repeat visitors.

Table 1 - Sample profile

| Variables | Frequency | Valid % |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Age | | |
| 21-29 years | 38 | 15.6 |
| 30-39 years | 53 | 21.8 |
| 40-49 years | 72 | 29.6 |
| 50-59 years | 61 | 25.1 |
| 60-69 years | 16 | 6.6 |
| 70 years and over | 3 | 1.2 |
| Education | | |
| Highschool | 34 | 14.0 |
| Bachelor's degree | 77 | 31.7 |
| Graduate degree | 78 | 32.1 |
| Associate degree | 45 | 18.5 |
| Other | 9 | 3.7 |
| Ethnicity | | |
| Caucasian | 130 | 53.5 |
| Hispanic | 74 | 30.5 |
| American Indian | 3 | 1.2 |
| African | | |
| American/Black | 13 | 5.3 |
| Asian or Pacific | | |
| Islander | 10 | 4.1 |
| Mixed | 13 | 5.3 |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 97 | 40.1 |
| Female | 145 | 59.9 |
| Local Residency | | |
| Local | 154 | 63.1 |
| Non-Local | 90 | 36.9 |
| Marital Status | | |
| Married | 150 | 61.7 |
| Single | 70 | 28.8 |
| With partner | 23 | 9.5 |
| Repeat Visitation | | |
| First-time visitor | 98 | 40.2 |
| Repeat visitor | 146 | 59.8 |
| Total | 244 | 100.0 |

Source: Personal compilation

5.2 Data Analysis

Factor Analysis

A total number of twelve measurement items of motivation items, ten items of loyalty, and thirty items of festivalscape factors from the literature review were analyzed through factor analysis to condense the large set of variables into a few underlying constructs. The results from the KMO and Bartlett's test all indicated that the selected factors were overall adequate to be measured for the study. In addition, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity in the result rejected (Sig. < .05) the null hypothesis that the original correlation matrix is an identity matrix, which further suggested that factor analysis was suitable. Factor analysis reduced each variable into one construct. Table 2 shows the summary for the factor analysis results.

**Table 2 - Rotated component matrix of factor analysis**

| Construct | Factor loadings |
|--|-----------------|
| Motivation | |
| Unique experience | 0.866 |
| Good value for the money | 0.795 |
| Opportunity to socialize | 0.777 |
| To see celebrity chefs and food network stars | 0.825 |
| Reputation / word-of-mouth | 0.770 |
| Local / close to home | 0.559 |
| Opportunity to relax | 0.864 |
| Opportunity to spend time with family / friends | 0.901 |
| Entertainment | 0.901 |
| Variety of events offered | 0.919 |
| Quality of the events offered | 0.783 |
| Introduction of new products at the festival | |
| Loyalty | |
| I would continue to attend even if the admission price increased. | 0.693 |
| I would pay more to attend this festival than for other festivals in the area. | 0.697 |
| I will spread positive word-of-mouth about this festival. | 0.712 |
| I plan to attend the festival next year (or in future years). | 0.767 |
| I will recommend this festival to my friends and family. | 0.691 |
| I would not return if this festival was not sponsored by Food Network. | 0.611 |
| I would not return if this event was not sponsored by Whole Foods. | 0.620 |
| I would not return if this festival was not sponsored by FIU. | 0.635 |
| I consider this festival to be my first choice over other festivals in the area. | 0.807 |
| I am highly committed to my relationship with this festival. | 0.749 |
| Festivalscape | |
| Program Content | |
| Program management | 0.948 |
| Program organization (schedule) | 0.961 |
| Variety of events | 0.901 |
| Staff | |
| Courteous | 0.954 |
| Knowledgeable | 0.957 |
| Quick responsiveness | 0.968 |
| Sufficient staffing levels | 0.936 |
| Facility | |
| Atmosphere of festival site | 0.949 |
| Cleanliness of festival site | 0.945 |
| Layout of the festival site | 0.933 |
| Space and size of festival site | 0.911 |
| Food | |
| Availability | 0.955 |
| Quality | 0.966 |
| Variety | 0.962 |
| Convenience | |
| Parking | 0.829 |
| Restroom | 0.829 |
| Benefits | |
| Celebrity Chefs | 0.574 |
| Discounts | 0.735 |
| MasterCard affiliation | 0.709 |
| Reimbursement of service failure | 0.783 |
| Souvenirs | 0.841 |
| Special events | 0.764 |
| Sweepstakes | 0.883 |
| Upgrades (Demo Pass) | 0.831 |
| Variety of choice in partnering businesses | 0.874 |
| Communication | |
| Pre-informational service | 0.926 |
| Newsletters | 0.952 |
| Brochures | 0.962 |
| General advertising | 0.961 |
| Communication with customers | 0.917 |

Source: Personal compilation.

Multiple Regression

Table 3 shows the summary for the regression analysis results where both motivation and loyalty were treated as the dependent variable after being condensed into one construct through factor analysis. Table 4 shows the summary for the coefficients for the regression analysis. Regression results turned out to be significant at the 0.05 significance level, thus

supported H1 and H2. R square values indicate the variance in the dependent explained by the independents. In general, higher R square values indicate a stronger regression model (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). Regression results indicated that 27.6 % of attendees' motivation was explained by the festivalscape factors and 23.6 % of attendees' loyalty was explained by the festivalscape factors.

Table 3 - Summary of regression analysis (N=244)

| Model | R ² | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|-------|-------|
| Motivation | 27.6 | 13.49 | 0.00* |
| Loyalty | 23.6 | 11.12 | 0.00* |

Note.*p<.05

Source: Personal compilation

Table 4 - Summary of regression coefficients (N=244)

| Model | Beta | | t | | p | |
|-----------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| | Motivation | Loyalty | Motivation | Loyalty | Motivation | Loyalty |
| Program content | 0.11 | 0.255 | 1.215 | 2.831 | 0.026* | 0.005* |
| Staff | -0.177 | -0.074 | -1.709 | -0.72 | 0.089 | 0.472 |
| Facility | 0.286 | 0.041 | 2.634 | 0.377 | 0.009* | 0.706 |
| Food | 0.068 | -0.007 | 2.711 | -2.068 | 0.037* | 0.026* |
| Convenience | -0.033 | 0.074 | -0.435 | 0.971 | 0.664 | 0.332 |
| Benefits | 0.066 | 0.009 | 2.637 | 2.194 | 0.013* | 0.029* |
| Communication | 0.141 | 0.201 | 3.494 | 2.119 | 0.007* | 0.035* |

Source: Personal compilation

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Two-Way Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed using festivalscape factors as the dependent variables and local and repeat visit as the independent variables. Festivalscape factors included a total number of seven dimensions: program content, staff demeanor, facility quality, food perception, benefits, convenience, and information availability. These seven underlying dimensions of festival environment cues were based from a previous study (Lee, Lee, Lee, & Babin, 2008). Local included two dimensions (local vs. non-local) and repeat visit included two dimensions as well (repeat visit vs. first time visitors). Box's M test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was observed to check the homogeneity of variance. Although the test was significant,

indicating a significant difference among local and repeat visit in the covariance matrices, this was not much of a problem due to the sample size (N = 244).

Table 5 shows the summary of the multivariate main effect. Only main effects were examined because there were no statistical interaction effects found. Locals had a statistically significant effect on the combined DVs, Wilks' $\lambda = .93$, $F(7, 234) = 2.66$, $p < .05$, with partial $\eta^2 = .07$. Power to detect the effect was .88. Overall, H3 was supported. However, repeat visit did not have a statistically significant effect on the combined DVs, Wilks' $\lambda = .99$, $F(7, 234) = 0.22$, $p > .05$, with partial $\eta^2 = .00$. Power to detect the effect was .11. Overall, H4 was not supported.

Table 5 - Summary of multivariate main effects

| | Wilks' λ | F | Sig. | Partial η^2 |
|-----------------|------------------|------|-------|------------------|
| Local Residency | 0.93 | 2.66 | 0.01* | 0.07 |
| Repeat Visit | 0.99 | 0.22 | 0.97 | 0.00 |

Note. *p<.05.

Source: Personal compilation

Given the significance of the overall test, follow-up ANOVAs were examined. Significant univariate main effects for locals were obtained for festivalscape factors. Table 6 shows the summary of the univariate main effects. Festivalscape factors were influenced by locals as the following: program content, $F(1, 240) = 12.36$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$; staff demeanor, $F(1,$

$240) = 13.11$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$; facility quality, $F(1, 240) = 8.06$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$; and information availability $F(1, 240) = 3.95$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. Food perception, benefits, and convenience were not significantly influenced. Lastly, Table 7 summarizes the descriptive statistics

**Table 6 - Summary of univariate main effects**

| Festivalscape factors | F | Sig. |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|
| Program content | 12.36 | 0.00* |
| Staff demeanor | 13.11 | 0.00* |
| Facility quality | 8.06 | 0.00* |
| Food perceptions | 3.21 | 0.07 |
| Benefits | 2.73 | 0.10 |
| Convenience | 0.09 | 0.75 |
| Information availability | 3.95 | 0.04* |

Source: Personal compilation.

Table 7 - Summary of descriptive statistics

| | Local | | Non-Local | |
|--------------------------|-------|------|-----------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD |
| Program content | 0.22 | 0.11 | -0.41 | 0.20 |
| Staff demeanor | 0.23 | 0.11 | -0.50 | 0.21 |
| Facility quality | 0.14 | 0.11 | -0.31 | 0.20 |
| Information availability | 0.20 | 0.12 | -0.39 | 0.21 |

Source: Personal compilation.

6. Discussion and conclusion

6.1 Summary of Findings

This study attempted to first investigate the impact of festivalscape factors on attendees' motivation and loyalty behavior. Additionally, this study attempted to examine how the festivalscape factors affect differently depending on the types of guests; whether they were local residents or non-local residents, and whether they were repeat visitors or first-time visitors. The findings of this study supported the study hypotheses that festivalscapes have a significant impact on attendees' motivation and loyalty behavior. Additionally, study findings supported the study hypothesis that the type of guests has a significant impact on the festivalscape factors. However, only local residency was supported and repeat visitation was not supported. Although study results differed from previous literature that repeat visitors and first-time visitors show distinctive tourist behaviors, findings of this study extended the literature on festivalscape related to the hospitality and tourism research and provided empirical support on its effect on motivation and loyalty.

6.2 Implications

Overall study findings are expected to be most valuable for marketers to enhance the practical utilization of festival management. It is important for festival organizers and marketers to understand clearly that different types of attendees perceive the festival environmental cues differently. This brings alert to festival management to customize their operational and marketing strategies depending on their target market. It is especially important to differentiate how festival managers promote the event to their target when attendees are comprised of both locals and non-locals. As evidenced by the sample profile, the festival in this study relies almost equally on both patron groups; other events with mixed residency attendance may benefit from the findings of this study. Academic implications of the findings of this study are the added contributions to the theoretical foundations by validating the impact of festivalscape factors in tourism marketing.

6.3 Limitations and Future Study Recommendations

As with all research, this study is subject to limitations. Findings from this study cannot be generalized to all festivals and festival participants, as the data was obtained from a single festival event in one destination. Given the limited number of studies that attempt to examine festival attendees' motivation and loyalty behavior among different types of guests, any replication of this study in other settings is expected to add contribution to the theoretical foundations of tourism content related to festivals. Future studies should attempt to incorporate other various factors and more deeply segment the type of attendees to further understand festival attendees' motivation and loyalty behavior.

References

- Allen, J., O'Toole, W., Harris, R., & McDonnell, I. (2011). *Festival & Special Event Management* (5th ed.). Milton, Qld: John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd.
- Backman, S. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Differentiating between high, spurious, latent, and low loyalty participants in two leisure activities. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 9(2), 1-17.
- Bagelym, M. N., & Mokhtarian, P. L. (2002). The impact of residential neighborhood type on travel behaviour: A structural equations modeling approach. *The Annals of Regional Science*, 36(2), 279-297.
- Baloglu, S. (2002). Dimensions of customer loyalty: Separating friends from well-wishers. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 47-60.
- Bansal, H., & Eiselt, H. B. (2004). Exploratory research of tourist motivations and planning. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 387-396.
- Bitner, M. J. (1990). Evaluating service encounters: the effect of physical surroundings and employee responses. *The Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), 69-82.
- Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes: the impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. *The Journal of Marketing*, 56(2), 57-71.
- Bowen, J. T., & Chen, S. (2001). The relationship between customer loyalty and customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(5), 213-17.
- Bowen, J. T. & Shoemaker, S. (2003). Loyalty: A strategic commitment. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 44(5/6), 31-46.

- Chen, C. F., & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31(1), 29-35.
- Cole, S. T., & Illum, S. F. (2006). Examining the mediating role of festival visitors' satisfaction in the relationship between service quality and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(2), 160-173.
- Correia, A., Oliveira, N., & Butler, R. (2008). First-time and repeat visitors to Cape Verde: the overall image. *Tourism Economics*, 14(1), 185-203.
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festivals events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425-439.
- Dann, G. M. (1981). Tourism motivations: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 189-219.
- Darden, W. R., & Babin, B. J. (1994). Exploring the concept of affective quality: expanding the concept of retail personality. *Journal of Business Research*, 29(2), 101-111.
- Delamere, T. A., Wankel, L. M., & Hinch, T. D. (2001). Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes towards the social impacts of community festivals. Part II: Verification of the scale. *Event Management*, 7(1), 11-24.
- Dick, A. S., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: Toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22(2), 99-113.
- Felsenstein, D., & Fleischer, A. (2003). Local festivals and tourism promotion: The role of public assistance and visitor expenditure. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(3), 385-392.
- Fodness, D. (1994). Measuring tourist motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 555-581.
- Food Network South Beach Wine & Food Festival Presented by FOOD & WINE. (n.d). About SOBEEFF Presented by FOOD & WINE. Retrieved May 31, 2013, from <http://www.sobefest.com/about.php>
- Formica, S. & Uysal, M. (1996). A market segmentation of festival visitors: Umbria Jazz Festival in Italy. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 3(4), 175-82.
- Gelder, G., & Robinson, P. (2009). A critical comparative study of visitor motivations for attending music festivals: A case study of Glastonbury and V-Festival. *Event Management*, 3, 181-196.
- Gitelson, R. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1984). Insights into the repeat vacation phenomenon. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(2), 199-217.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis (6th edition)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Jacoby, J., & Chestnut, R. W. (1978). *Brand loyalty: Measurement and Management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jang, S., & Feng, R. (2007). Temporal destination revisit intention: the effects of novelty seeking and satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 580-590.
- Kruger, M., Saayman, M., & Ellis, S. M. (2010). Does loyalty pay? First-time versus repeat visitors at a national arts festival. *South African Business Review*, 14(1), 79-104.
- Lau, L. S., & McKercher, B. (2004). Exploration versus consumption: A comparison of first-time and repeat tourists. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(3), 279-285.
- Lee, C. K., Yoon, Y. S., & Lee, S. K. (2007). Investigating the relationships among perceived value, satisfaction, and recommendations: The case of the Korean DMZ. *Tourism Management*, 28(1), 204-214.
- Lee, Y. K., Lee, C. K., Lee, S. K., & Babin, B. J. (2008). Festivalscapes and patrons' emotions, satisfaction, and loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(1), 56-64.
- Lee, J. S., Lee, C. K., & Yoon, Y. (2009). Investigating differences in antecedents to value between first-time and repeat festival-goers. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26(7), 688-702.
- Lee, T. H. (2009). A structural model to examine how destination image, attitude, and motivation affect the future behavior of tourists. *Leisure Sciences*, 31(3), 215-236.
- Lee, T. S., & Hsu, F. Y. (2013). Examining how attending motivation and satisfaction affects the loyalty for attendees at Aboriginal festivals. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 18-34.
- Lentnek, B., Harwitz, M., & Narula, S. C. (1981). Studies in choice, constraints, and human spatial behaviours. *Economic Geography*, 57(4), 362-372.
- Li, X., Cheng, C., Kim, H., & Petrick, J. F. (2008). A systematic comparison of first-time and repeat visitors via a two-phase online survey. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 278-293.
- Liang, Y., Illum, S. F., & Cole, S. T. (2008). Benefits received and behavioural intentions of festival visitors in relation to distance travelled and other origins. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 4(1), 12-23.
- Loots, I., Ellis, S., & Slabbert, E. (2011). Factors predicting community support: The case of a South African arts festival. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 7, 121-130.
- McKercher, B., & Wong, D. Y. Y. (2004). Understanding tourism behavior: Examining the combined effects of prior visitation history and destination status. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(2), 171-179.
- Mehrabian, A., & Russel, J. (1974). *An Approach to Environmental Psychology*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mohr, K., Backman, K. F., Gahan L. W., & Backman, S. J. (1993). An investigation of festival motivations and event satisfaction by visitor type. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 1(3), 89-97.
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20-38.
- Mosley, M. C., Lehto, X., & Day, J. (2011). Proceedings from the 16th Annual Graduate Student Research Conference in Hospitality & Tourism: *The Influence of the Jazz Festival Experience on Tourist Behavior*. Houston, TX: UMassAmherst.
- Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 63(4), 33-44.
- Opperman, M. (2000). Tourism destination loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 78-84.
- Petrick, J. F. (2004). Are loyal visitors desired visitors? *Tourism Management*, 25(4), 463-470.
- Prentice, R., & Anderson, V. (2003). Festival as creative destination. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 7-30.
- Saayman, M. (2004). *An Introduction to Sports Tourism and Events Management (2nd Ed.)*. Potchefstroom, South Africa: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- Shanka, T., & Taylor, R. (2004). Discriminating factors of the first-time and repeat visitors to wine festivals. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7(2), 134-145.
- Son, S. M., & Lee, K. M. (2011). Assessing the influences of festival quality and satisfaction on visitor behavioral intentions. *Event Management*, 15(3), 293-303.
- Um, S., Chon, K., & Ro, Y. (2006). Antecedents of revisit intention. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), 1141-1158.
- Uys, M. C. (2003). A sustainable marketing strategy for Dutch tourists to South Africa. Master's dissertation, Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, Potchefstroom, South Africa.
- Uysal, M., Gahan, L. & Martin, B. (1993). An examination of event motivations: A case study. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 1(1), 5-10.
- Wamwara-Mbugua, L. W., & Cornwell, T. B. (2009). Visitor motivation to attending international festivals. *Event Management*, 13(4), 277-286.
- Wang, D. (2004). Tourist behavior and repeat visitation to Hong Kong. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(1), 99-118.
- Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45-56.

Article history:

Submitted: 28 June 2013

Accepted: 29 October 2013