

# Satisfaction at a university festival: A factor analysis of different visitor groups

David Williams, Hidekazu Iwamoto, Tatsuya Uchiyama

## Abstract

Using factor analysis this paper examines the satisfaction of visitors to a university festival (*gakuensai*). Rather than satisfaction being seen as a function of motivation, the social psychology approach taken here regards satisfaction as the result of an aggregate of factors, or “antecedents”, determined by individuals backgrounds, culture, age and experience. Results indicate that there are more statistically significant differences between groups of the same culture than there are where cultures are dissimilar. To ensure sustainability, festivals need to consider the combined effect of the factors or “flow” that act as antecedents to satisfaction across, and within all visitor types.

**Keywords:** festival, satisfaction; flow; antecedent; within-group; between-group; *gakuensai*

## 1. Introduction

For as long as humankind has held events and festivals and people have journeyed to attend them, visits to events have been an integral part of the human social experience. Whether at the scale of the ancient Olympics, medieval village fetes, pilgrimages, or 18<sup>th</sup> century European frost fairs such experiences have brought people together for recreational, social, or commercial purposes for thousands of years. These beginnings can be thought of as the embryo of what is now called “event tourism”, the travelling by individuals to places for periodic, or one time events for personal, cultural, or heritage purposes (Getz, 2008).

Now a part of the contemporary global tourism phenomenon, event tourism encompasses a range of activities from so-called mega events such as the FIFA World Cup, through hallmark events such as the Edinburgh Festival, to smaller regional and local events that promote a local area, its culture, tradition or heritage (Mckercher, Mei, & Tse, 2006). At all scales events can stimulate the local economy (Getz, 2008), develop infrastructure (Kim, Ahn & Wicks, 2014) and, at the local level, create a forum for a more authentic experience for the visitor. In doing so, localized event tourism can raise the profile of local products, improve civic pride and enhance local cultural identity and stability

(Ashkenazi, 1990). In the context of cultural events, Esu and Arrey (2009), refer to this as “social reproduction” (p.116), or the economic and social regeneration of the local area through tourism.

As the current enthusiasm for the Olympics in Japan shows it is mega events that stir the public imagination and take center stage in government tourism policy. However, it is at the local and grass roots level where event tourism can make a profound impact on communities (Akiyoshi, 2013; Minamizono, Kaneko, Minamizono & Motohashi, 2013). Whether such events have a culinary focus (Nield, Kozak & Legry, 2000), are nature-based (Meng, Tepanon, & Uysal, 2008), introduce music (Blesic, Pivac, Stamenkovic & Besermenji, 2013), or promote wine (Sparks, 2007), it is visitor satisfaction with the event experience that will determine the level of success and repeat visitation (Byrd, Beedle, & Cardenas, 2014). In this respect much research points to the issue of quality of delivery (Yoon, Lee, & Lee, 2010; Baker & Crompton, 2000) of experience. With a contemporary focus on tourism as a tool to stimulate regional regeneration in Japan’s declining hinterlands, a deeper understanding of event tourism satisfaction and the quality of delivery of such events is thus an important area for academic enquiry.

## 2. Previous research and conceptual framework

Much previous research into satisfaction of tourism experiences has been made with the needs of tourism marketing in mind (Esu & Arrey, 2009) and with ‘motivation’ often highlighted as the key determinant of satisfaction. The reader is directed to Yoon and Uysal (2005), Crompton and McKay (1997), and Scott (1996) for salient discussion on this. In a departure from these works, the current research is informed by the social psychological approach of Ryan (1995) whose work recognizes the existence of factors or “antecedents” (p.41) as key to understanding visitor satisfaction. These “antecedents” can be summarized as being factors associated with the personality of the individual, and the circumstances in which he or she undertakes a(an) (leisure/tourism) activity or participates in a(an) (leisure/tourism) event.

Ryan indicates that although motivation plays a part in determining tourists’ participation in an activity, it is only one part of the puzzle in understanding visitor satisfaction. Satisfaction he claims depends on an individual’s circumstances including any previous experience; skill, knowledge or ability; novelty; and expected outcomes. Where these factors, or “antecedents”, produce a sufficient level of arousal (Yerkes-Dodson, 1908, in Ryan) visitor satisfaction will ensue, However, if antecedent circumstances are less than optimal such as if an activity is too familiar, or its novelty is too low, boredom and/or alienation from participation can result. Hill and Perkins (1985, in Ryan) thus suggest it is the antecedents and their results that direct satisfaction rather than motivation *per se*. Ryan also points to a need for “gap analysis”, or assessment of the differences between the outcomes visitors

expect and those they receive by participating in tourist activity. When considering satisfaction such assessment will help us to understand circumstances where visitors' high expectations are not met, and thus help explain satisfaction levels.

The challenge of the activity engaged in by visitors/tourists is a further key concept determining satisfaction. Where the challenge level of participation (or, an activity) is too high for the participant, satisfaction is likely to be limited. This is typically found in visitor participation in cultural activities in culturally dissimilar destinations (such as visiting local museums) in a foreign country. In such situations visitors may - despite having sufficient motivation to engage in activity - only be able to make superficial understanding of their experiences. By lacking the cultural skills to process the experience, the task - or "challenge" - of understanding may be too great. In such cases less than optimal satisfaction may result, and possibly lead to frustration or dissatisfaction. Under such circumstances bicultural "guides" or interpreters, language or otherwise, may be required to decode experiences and activities to visitors (Nield, Kozak, and Legrys, 2000). Events attracting visitors from abroad thus need to consider more than just the motivation in order to fully understand visitor satisfaction.

Satisfaction can also be a function of experience or age. Due to experience older visitors may in many instances have a higher novelty threshold, but a lower tolerance for physical activities, while younger more physically-able participants may have lack knowledge due to minimal experience. The result being that an event giving satisfaction to the older generations may be less than satisfactory for a younger audience –and by extension the reverse may also be true. In this respect understanding satisfaction across different demographic groups can be a useful asset to the planning and development of successful event tourism.

Another compelling way to look at the determinants of satisfaction beyond satisfaction is the conceptual framework of "flow". As defined by Csikszentimihalyi (1975), "flow" is a continuum of factors (i.e. antecedents) based on an individual's personality, experience and expectations that direct a propensity to participate. If participation in an activity is voluntary and is thought of as being beneficial, an individual will "invest themselves" (p.43) in the activity and "flow" will result. Optimal flow, or flow giving the highest satisfaction, is a confluence of 'best case' conditions where each factor of flow is maximized. Pearce (1988) suggests that since tourism is an activity we willingly engage in, and is perceived as something positive, "flow" is a useful framework to consider satisfaction in tourism studies.

From the arguments above it seems clear that motivation can only be considered as one determinant of satisfaction. Indeed, relying on motivation alone to explain satisfaction is further complicated by the fact that holidaymakers and leisure seekers tend not to be rational decision makers. Ryan (1995) suggests that this is due to the unique circumstances in which tourism and leisure exist. Not only are tourist activities out of the ordinary routine of life, but in leisure time there are minimal demands on time (i.e. there is rarely something that must be done). For these reasons Ryan suggests visitors and

tourists act “mindlessly” (p.41). Thus decisions to participate in leisure activities while vacationing are not made according to time/money considerations. Compounding this, Kozak (2001) points to tourists having a lack of information, or understanding about events they engage in meaning their decisions tend to be “constrained”. The result is that visitors participate in activities that can be ‘out of character’, or that do not reflect their own individual rational decision making belief system.

From the arguments above we can see the task of measuring visitor satisfaction is complex and difficult. The idea that satisfaction is more likely to be understood through knowledge of satisfaction antecedents and “flow” is an attractive one especially where participants are of different ages and come from different cultures. Fortunately there is a large body of work from which the current research can draw on to investigate this phenomenon including Yoon, Lee and Lee (2010) who usefully employed factors of satisfaction to describe festival participation. In combination with the work of Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004) on visitor satisfaction in different demographic groups an excellent template was provided for the aims of the current research.

### 3. Festivals and Japanese universities

As a country spread over a broad geographical area, Japan has a wide variety of cultural festivals to display the multifaceted dimensions of Japanese customs, traditions and identity. One such cultural festival is the university festival or *gakuensai*. The *gakuensai* is an annual autumn event held on all on university campuses in Japan. Although planned and prepared by students for students the festival is open to the public. It is a key date in the calendar of all tertiary institutes in Japan, much anticipated by students, and is mandated by the Japanese Ministry of Education (Iwamoto, Williams & Uchiyama, 2015) as a part of students’ educational experience.

The *gakuensai* showcases presentations and performances given by students and local artists, but perhaps its most important feature is the non-profit food stalls - known as *mogiten* - from which groups of students sell prepared food and snacks. Entry to the *gakuensai*, its entertainment and exhibits is free and the only costs incurred by visitors are on transport to the festival and any food purchased from the *mogiten*. Students are unsupervised in their preparations for the festival and a special students’ committee is established for festival planning and development.

The *gakuensai* is also an important conduit through which the university can connect itself to the local community. In recent years this conduit is becoming more important as universities attempt to forge closer ties with their hinterlands to complement activities such as extension education, internship provision, and outreach programs. Moreover, with the burgeoning number of foreign students at Japanese universities, the *gakuensai* is now a unique chance for members of local communities to experience a youthful global atmosphere.

## 4. The Current Research

### 4. 1 The context for the current research

The current research, the second of its kind by the authors, was carried out at Josai International University, Faculty of Tourism campus in Kamogawa in July 2015 during its annual *gakuensai* known as *Koryu Day* (exchange day), hereafter KD. Usually an autumn event, KD in 2015 was rescheduled to the summer to allow 100 students from ASEAN countries, who had joined a 3-weeks' residential intensive program held coincidentally at Josai International University, to take part and experience a Japanese *gakuensai*. These 100 students were encouraged to give their own cultural performances and be active participants in the festival.

Koryu Day 2015 thus had a strong international atmosphere but presented a number of challenges for the organizing committee to coordinate performances given by the 100 temporarily visiting students. Most of these students were not at the campus prior to KD and it was difficult for the organizing committee to brief them fully in a timely fashion.

The conditions under which KD 2015 was held - and the make-up of the participants were thus quite different from 2014. However, this was seen as an opportunity rather than a problem. With participants from different backgrounds, the *gakuensai*'s larger scale and greater internationality, the researchers identified a chance to make new insights into visitor satisfaction at a Japanese university festival and in doing so contribute to the body of research in the field of event tourism.

### 4. 2 Paucity of research

Despite considerable research into event tourism by researchers in Asia (see Yoon, Lee, and Lee 2010), authors in North America (Getz, 2008), and the publication of journals exclusively dedicated to event tourism such as *Event Management*, there has been a paucity of research into the festival tourism phenomenon in Japan. Recent research by Morishita (2014) and Akiyoshi (2013) have examined festival tourism from a theoretical standpoint while Minamizono, Kaneko, Minamizono, and Motohashi (2013), and Niori (2012) have extended this to explore any effects on festival participants in Japan. It was not until the current authors made their exploratory study in 2015 (Iwamoto, Williams, and Uchiyama, 2015) that any such research had taken place at a *gakuensai* with the ostensive purpose of examining participants' satisfaction. The current research aims to build on this by focusing on the satisfaction between different demographic groups of visitor.

### 4. 3 Aims of the current research

(i) To examine the satisfaction of visitors at a university festival through a factor analysis approach, and to identify those factors that were most satisfactory across different demographic subgroups of visitors.

(ii) To examine any differences in satisfaction between different demographic groups of visitors attending the festival and to make observations based on a framework of satisfaction “antecedents” (Ryan, 1995) and “flow” (Csikszentimihalyi, 1975).

As a footnote to these aims, throughout the paper, the word “visitor” denotes those persons participating in the festival who are outside the festival organization itself. In the current research “visitor” thus encompasses foreign students, student visitors from other universities under the Josai umbrella, and persons attending the festival from the local, and broader communities.

## 5. Methodology

### 5. 1 Data research instrument

Based on previous research into festival motivation and satisfaction by Yoon, Lee, & Lee (2010) and the current authors (Iwamoto, Williams & Uchiyama, 2015), a 25-item questionnaire instrument was developed. Japanese language and English language formats of the instrument were administered using a convenience sampling technique during the *gakuensai*. In a departure from the authors’ previous paper, which covered both motivation and satisfaction, the focus of the current research was respondents’ satisfaction with *Koryu Day*, and the way in which different demographic groups expressed this satisfaction. As a result some items from the 2015 research were omitted. In addition, to overcome the issue of “acquiescence response bias” (Krosnick & Presser, 2010), some previously used instrument items were reworded. The resultant questionnaire comprised of 15 items to examine four factors of festival visitors’ satisfaction (“information service”, “festival program”, “food”, and “festival value and loyalty”). To allow for inter-group consideration through ANOVA analysis items were designed as Likert scale data type (Boone & Boone, 2012). A further 10 items elicited respondents’ demographic characteristics. In both language formats the questionnaire was presented to respondents in a one sided B-4 format.

### 5. 2 Data collection and analysis

Questionnaires were distributed to festival participants who were instructed to return completed answers to one of two designated collection points. A total of 140 questionnaires were returned of which 60 were English language versions and 80 were Japanese. All returned questionnaires were considered suitable for inclusion in the analysis. Analysis was made by considering the distribution of satisfaction for each item for the sample as a whole, satisfaction within demographic groups and, using single tailed ANOVA analysis, satisfaction between these groups. Unless otherwise stated alpha significance levels of  $p < 0.05$  were applied throughout.

## 6. Results

### 6. 1 Demographic characteristics of *koryu day* participants

The demographic profiles of respondents are presented in Table 1. The gender composition of the sample ( $N=140$ ) was 69% female and 31% male. In terms of age groupings, the largest proportion of the sample was in the 20-29 age range (49%). 19% of respondents were in the over 60s age group, and a further 16% were teenagers. The gender/age profile of respondents is similar to our 2015 research.

*Koryu Day* 2015 was held during an ASEAN countries students' study program and consequently the festival welcomed a large number of foreign visitors from South-East Asia. A total of 42% of the sample were foreign nationals and 56% were Japanese (2% were unknown). The countries represented in the data were China (PRC and RoC) (10%), South Korea and Malaysia (both 9%), Bangladesh (8%), Indonesia (4%), and Thailand (3%). In contrast to the previous year's research there were fewer respondents from European countries (1%).

Table 1. Demographic profile of respondents (N=140)

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	97	69.3
Male	43	30.7
<b>Age</b>		
10-19	22	15.7
20-29	69	49.3
30-39	5	3.6
40-49	9	6.4
50-59	6	4.3
60 and over	27	19.3
No data	2	1.4
<b>Nationality</b>		
Japan	78	55.7
PR China / Rep of China (Taiwan)	14	10
South Korea	13	9.3
Malaysia	13	9.3
Bangladesh	8	5.7
Indonesia	5	3.6
Other (incl. Thailand, EU countries)	6	4.3
No data	3	2.1

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent (%)
<b>Occupation</b>		
Tertiary education	67	47.9
Housewife	21	15
High school	16	11.4
Full-time employee (incl. self-employed)	15	10.7
Retired	9	6.4
Other (incl. part time employee)	8	5.7
No answer	4	2.9
<b>Visits to Koryu Day</b>		
One (first visit)	97	69.3
Two (second visit)	23	16.4
Three or more	19	13.6
<b>Transport</b>		
Chartered bus	54	38.6
Car	48	34.3
Local bus	10	7.1
Bicycle	8	5.7
Train	6	4.3
Other	10	7.1
<b>Information source</b>		
Homepage (JIU, Faculty of Tourism)	23	16.4
Poster/leaflet	21	15
Seminar or Event	17	12.1
Facebook (JIU, Faculty of Tourism)	13	9.3
Other	59	42.1
No answer	7	5

Regarding occupational status, the largest share of respondents (48%) classified themselves as a ‘tertiary education student’ (incl. postgraduate student and vocational schools). ‘Housewife’ was indicated by 15% of respondents, ‘full-time employee’ by 11%, and ‘high school student’ by a further 11%. Those indicating ‘retired’ comprised 6% while ‘other’ occupations (including part-time employment) accounted for an additional 6% of the 140 respondents.

Concerning the number of visits to *Koryu Day* 2015, first time visitors constituted 69% of respondents and repeaters 30%; of this 30%, first time repeaters made up 16% and multiple repeaters 14%. The female / male ratio of repeat visitors was 69:31 (i.e. equal to the whole population). Japanese nationals made up 84% of repeaters of which 60% ( $n=29$ ) were Japanese females and 24% ( $n=13$ ) were Japanese males. The vast majority of repeat visitors (81%) were in one of two main age groups: aged

10-29 (38% of repeaters), or over 60 years of age (43%). These results concur with *Koryu Day* 2014.

Transport to *Koryu Day* was largely by car (34%) or bus (39%) with a smaller number of respondents travelling by bicycle (6%), or other means (7%). Visitors started their journeys to *KD* mostly from one of two main points: ‘Kamogawa’ (37%) - where the festival was held – and ‘overseas’ (31%), the response given by temporarily visiting overseas students. A further 12% indicated ‘other parts of Chiba’ while 7% indicated they had travelled to the festival from ‘other parts of Japan’. From these observations we can understand that *KD* 2015 was very much a local festival with a strong international flavor.

## 6. 2 Measurement of visitors’ satisfaction at *Koryu Day*

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the 15 items used to measure four factors of festival visitors’ satisfaction for the 140 respondents. Mean Likert scale data scores were highest for “I believe I did the right thing coming to the festival” [RIGHT], ( $M=4.17$ ); “the festival was a positive experience” [POSITIVE], ( $4.11$ ); and “on the whole I am happy with the festival” [HAPPY], ( $4.11$ ). That is, items relating to the festival value and loyalty (factor 4) were highly evaluated. “Student staff were good guides” [GUIDES] and “the festival was enjoyable” [ENJOYABLE] were also seen as highly satisfactory. By contrast, the lowest satisfaction related to factors of information services (factor 1) and the program (factor 2). Thus “pamphlets were well prepared” [PAMPHLETS], and “I had good knowledge about the festival before today” [KNOW], received mean scores of 3.48 and 3.45 respectively while “the festival was well organized” [ORGANIZED], returned a mean score of 3.63. As Table 2 indicates standard deviation (*sd*) values for the 15 items were mostly in the range 0.8-1.1. Notable exceptions to this were [KNOW], ( $sd=1.17$ ) and [PAMPHLET] ( $1.22$ ).

Table 2. Measurement of visitors' satisfaction at a university festival

Question item	N	Mean (2dp)	SD (2dp)
Factor 1: Information Service			
I had good knowledge about the festival before today [KNOW]	128	3.45	1.17
Pamphlets were well prepared [PAMPHLETS]	120	3.48	1.22
Students staff were good guides [GUIDES]	131	4.06	0.93
Factor 2: Festival Program			
The festival was enjoyable [ENJOYABLE]	131	4.0	0.84
There was a good range of activities [ACTIVITIES]	131	3.80	0.92
The festival was well organized [ORGANIZED]	140	3.63	1.09
Factor 3: Food			
Stall food was reasonably priced [FOOD_PRICE]	129	3.79	0.84
The festival stall food was good [FOOD_GOOD]	130	3.86	0.90
The festival stalls were unique [UNIQUE]	133	3.84	0.88
Factor 4: Festival value and loyalty			
The festival was a positive experience [POSITIVE]	130	4.11	0.94
I believe I did the right thing in coming to the festival [RIGHT]	132	4.17	0.80
On the whole I am happy with the festival [HAPPY]	132	4.11	0.91
I will spread positive word of mouth about the festival [MOUTH]	132	3.92	0.96
I will recommend this festival to friends, family & neighbors [FRIENDS]	132	3.91	1.0
I would like to attend this festival again next year [AGAIN]	128	3.97	1.05

### 6. 2. 1 Within demographic groups

A key feature of the faculty of tourism students' festival is the diverse demographic of visitors it attracts. High school students, retired pensioners and foreign students are among the different demographic groups that visit the festival each year (Iwamoto, Williams & Uchiyama, 2015). Evidence from Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004) and anecdotal evidence from our study of *Koryu Day* 2014 suggests different demographic groupings have different needs and motivations. This evidence was the impetus for us to examine both the within-group and cross-group aspects of festival satisfaction in the current research.

To facilitate the within-groups comparison 5 demographic groups were extracted from the sample (Mohr, Backman, Gahan & Backman; 1993). These were (i) Japanese teenagers ("JTeens"); (ii) Japanese aged 20-59 ("J20-59"); (iii) Japanese aged 60 or more ("J60+"); (iv) foreign visitors ("ForeignVis") and (v) festival repeat visitors ("RepeatVis"). The descriptive within-group data for

each of the 15 items is presented in Table 3. For ease of consideration, for each respective demographic subgroup, the items delivering the three highest mean satisfaction values are highlighted in **bold** while items showing the *lowest* mean satisfaction are boxed. For comparison, data for all Japanese respondents ( $n=78$ ) is shown in column 1.

Examining the items giving high satisfaction, we can see that GUIDES, FOOD\_GOOD, RIGHT, HAPPY and AGAIN are those that respondents consistently evaluated the highest. These 5 items provided 14 of the 17 highlighted most satisfactory aspects of the *gakuensai*. In similar fashion, just 3 items (KNOW, PAMPHLETS, and ORGANIZED) covered 11 of the 15 lowest evaluated items. Examining each demographic group in turn does however reveal some differences in this apparently uniform pattern of items delivering high and low satisfaction.

JTeens rated FOOD\_GOOD, POSITIVE and RIGHT the highest, and in general evaluated festival value and loyalty factors (6 items) more enthusiastically than other age groups (mean=4.3). JTeens were also the only demographic to evaluate ACTIVITIES and FOOD PRICE as their least satisfactory aspect of the festival.

Mirroring the sentiment of their younger cohorts, the J20-59 group also evaluated festival value and loyalty factors HAPPY and RIGHT the highest, but did so with the lowest mean satisfaction score of any of the groups with a score of 3.68 for its 3 best rated items (c/f whole sample=4.14). J20-59 evaluated ORGANISED, KNOW and PAMPHLETS the least favourably. The mean of 3.29 was the lowest among any of the demographic groups.

The J60+ group exhibited similar preferences to the J20-59 group in respect of their most satisfactory interactions at the festival (RIGHT, HAPPY) but also evaluated the loyalty factor AGAIN ( $M=4.3$ ) highly. The least satisfactory items for the J60+s were two food factor items FOOD\_GOOD ( $M=3.76$ ) and UNIQUE ( $M=3.82$ ), an anomaly for the sample overall. Overall J60+s gave higher satisfaction scores than all other groups. This is illustrated by the mean (M) value for their 3 *least* satisfactory items being only 0.13 lower than J20-59's average for the *most* satisfactory items (mean=3.86).

ForeignVis, like their counterparts, evaluated factors relating to festival value highly. POSITIVE and RIGHT recorded the highest M value in this group ( $M=4.2$  and  $4.19$  respectively) with guiding services also highly satisfactory (GUIDES,  $M=4.19$ ). However, reflecting the tendency in the overall sample, ForeignVis were least satisfied with ORGANIZED, KNOW, and PAMPHLETS recording M values of 3.54, 3.4 and 3.36 respectively.

The final demographic group festival repeat visitors (RepeatVis) was made up of respondents from all the above subgroups and as such the group's results cannot be considered as being independent. However, observations show RepeatVis mirror the key tendencies in the sample as a whole and thus an assessment of this group informs the whole sample population. As we might

expect RepeatVis attach positive emphasis on the value and loyalty aspects of festival satisfaction. RIGHT ( $M=4.41$ ), HAPPY ( $M=4.32$ ) and GUIDES ( $M=4.19$ ) all being highly evaluated by the group. However, they also stress the overall sample's relatively poor satisfaction with information services (factor 1) PAMPHLETS and KNOW and program item, ORGANISED.

Table 3. Measurement of satisfaction across groups (N = 140)

	All Japanese (n=78)	Japanese Teens (n=22)	Japanese age 20-59 (n=32)	Japanese age 60+ (n=28)	Foreigner Visitor (n=59)	Festival Repeater (n=43)
[KNOW]	<u>3.51</u> (1.20)	<u>3.35</u> (1.35)	<u>3.26</u> (1.12)	3.95 (1.02)	<u>3.40</u> (1.1)	<u>3.57</u> (1.32)
[PAMPHLETS]	<u>3.61</u> (1.01)	4 (0.79)	<u>3.37</u> (1.13)	<u>3.67</u> (0.91)	<u>3.36</u> (1.38)	<u>3.71</u> (1.03)
[GUIDES]	3.94 (0.82)	4.23 (0.81)	3.59 (0.87)	4.14 (0.57)	<b>4.19</b> (1.04)	<b>4.19</b> (0.74)
[ENJOYABLE]	3.96 (0.82)	4.25 (0.79)	3.69 (0.90)	4 (0.53)	4.03 (0.92)	4 (0.84)
[ACTIVITIES]	3.80 (0.79)	<u>3.91</u> (0.87)	3.65 (0.88)	3.91 (0.53)	3.83 (0.99)	4.08 (0.83)
[ORGANIZED]	<u>3.72</u> (0.96)	4.10 (0.87)	<u>3.23</u> (1.06)	4 (0.55)	<u>3.54</u> (1.2)	<u>3.86</u> (0.95)
[FOOD_PRICE]	3.79 (0.78)	<u>3.95</u> (0.79)	3.58 (0.89)	3.9 (0.55)	3.81 (0.91)	3.94 (0.67)
[FOOD_GOOD]	4 (0.81)	<b>4.60</b> (0.59)	<b>3.81</b> (0.79)	<u>3.76</u> (0.77)	3.74 (0.95)	4.14 (0.75)
[UNIQUE]	3.90 (0.73)	4.18 (0.73)	<b>3.81</b> (0.78)	<u>3.82</u> (0.66)	3.78 (1.04)	4.05 (0.84)
[POSITIVE]	4 (0.99)	<b>4.36</b> (0.73)	3.78 (1.10)	4.05 (0.97)	<b>4.20</b> (0.87)	4.14 (0.90)
[RIGHT]	<b>4.14</b> (0.84)	<b>4.45</b> (0.67)	<b>3.88</b> (0.98)	<b>4.24</b> (0.62)	<b>4.19</b> (0.76)	<b>4.41</b> (0.61)
[HAPPY]	<b>4.11</b> (0.86)	4.27 (0.94)	<b>3.90</b> (0.93)	<b>4.20</b> (0.68)	4.10 (0.97)	<b>4.32</b> (0.78)
[MOUTH]	3.89 (0.91)	4.27 (0.70)	3.48 (1.03)	4.14 (0.71)	3.95 (1.03)	4.11 (0.92)
[FRIENDS]	3.89 (1.00)	4.23 (0.92)	3.52 (1.03)	4.14 (0.89)	3.93 (1.01)	4.05 (0.96)
[AGAIN]	3.94 (1.05)	4.18 (0.80)	3.58 (1.23)	<b>4.3</b> (0.73)	3.98 (1.07)	<b>4.19</b> (0.97)

Note: in each cell the value on the left is the mean (M) Likert score; the value in ( ) is the derived SD ( $\sigma$ ).

## 6. 2. 2 Between demographic groups

According to the scale data mean score analysis (M) for within demographic groups shown in 6.2.1 there is a convergence of satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels between groups for some items and a divergence in satisfaction for others. Concerning the convergent trend RIGHT was evaluated highly by all groups, while KNOW was evaluated poorly by 4 of the groups. Divergent satisfaction on the other hand was found for ORGANISED. JTeens evaluated this item with a mean of 4.1, while J20-59 gave a score of just 3.23. There was similar divergent satisfaction for FOOD\_GOOD between the J60+ demographic which evaluated the item poorly and other groups that attached high

satisfaction to it. As a way to investigate any *statistical* significance in these different levels of satisfaction ANOVA analysis was performed across 5 demographic groups ( $df = 4$ ) (Table 4). The null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) that there is no significant difference between the groups under consideration was posited for each item.

Table 4. Comparison of cross group satisfaction (ANOVA analysis)

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	$H_0$ Reject/Accept
[KNOW]	7.19	4	1.798	1.276	0.281	ACCEPT
[PAMPHLETS]	6.791	4	1.698	1.554	0.19	ACCEPT
[GUIDES]	9.388	4	2.347	3.103	<b>0.017</b>	<b>REJECT</b>
[ENJOYABLE]	4.318	4	1.079	1.52	0.199	ACCEPT
[ACTIVITIES]	3.294	4	0.824	1.081	0.368	ACCEPT
[ORGANIZED]	14.622	4	3.655	3.53	<b>0.009*</b>	<b>REJECT</b>
[FOOD_PRICE]	2.806	4	0.701	1.079	0.369	ACCEPT
[FOOD_GOOD]	14.504	4	3.626	5.438	<b>0*</b>	<b>REJECT</b>
[UNIQUE]	3.815	4	0.954	1.254	0.29	ACCEPT
[POSITIVE]	5.43	4	1.358	1.604	0.176	ACCEPT
[RIGHT]	6.259	4	1.565	2.663	<b>0.034</b>	<b>REJECT</b>
[HAPPY]	3.579	4	0.895	1.134	0.342	ACCEPT
[MOUTH]	10.824	4	2.706	3.109	<b>0.017</b>	<b>REJECT</b>
[FRIENDS]	8.653	4	2.163	2.266	0.064**	ACCEPT
[AGAIN]	9.29	4	2.323	2.255	0.065**	ACCEPT

\* significant at  $p = 0.01$

\*\* close to statistical significance

As shown in Table 4, across the 5 demographic groups the null hypothesis that there is no statistical difference between the groups for the given items could be rejected for GUIDES, ORGANISED, FOOD\_GOOD, RIGHT, and MOUTH (all  $p < 0.05$ ). This suggests the difference between the mean satisfaction levels is not likely to have been caused by chance, and may be the result of characteristics of the demographic group itself. Of particular note are FOOD\_GOOD and ORGANISED which delivered scores at  $p < 0.01$ . For the other 10 items any differences in mean scores and sample distribution as measured by the standard deviation, indicated no statistical significance thus leading to acceptance of the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ). It is also of interest that both FRIENDS and

AGAIN were close to significance ( $p=0.065$ ).

For each of the 5 items above where the null hypothesis could be rejected ( $df=4$ ) further ANOVA analysis was carried out. For each item (dependent variable) between groups ANOVA scores were calculated for each demographic group pairing (i.e. 10 operations per item) where  $df=1$ . A total of 50 operations were carried out of which 11 were found to be statistically significant ( $p<0.05$ ) to reject the null hypothesis. These 11 significant results are displayed in Table 5. For convenience statistically significant results for  $df=4$  (Table 4) are repeated in the top row of each cell.

Table 5. ANOVA analysis for items with significant cross group differences

Item (Variables)	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
<b>[GUIDES]</b>	9.388	4	2.347	3.103	<b>0.017</b>
ForeignVis*J20-59	7.378	1	7.378	7.638	<b>0.007</b>
JTeen*J20-59	5.34	1	5.34	7.458	<b>0.009</b>
<b>[ORGANIZED]</b>	14.622	4	3.655	3.53	<b>0.009*</b>
ForeignVis*JTeen	4.978	1	4.978	3.971	<b>0.05</b>
JTeen*J20-59	9.74	1	9.74	10.314	<b>0.003</b>
<b>[FOOD_GOOD]</b>	14.504	4	3.626	5.438	<b>0*</b>
ForeignVis*Repeat	3.59	1	3.59	4.665	<b>0.033</b>
ForeignVis*JTeen	11.74	1	11.74	15.626	<b>0</b>
JTeen*J60+	7.581	1	7.581	16.216	<b>0</b>
JTeen*J20-59	8.031	1	8.031	15.733	<b>0</b>
<b>[RIGHT]</b>	6.259	4	1.565	2.663	<b>0.034</b>
JTeen*J20-59	4.236	1	4.236	5.619	<b>0.022</b>
<b>[MOUTH]</b>	10.824	4	2.706	3.109	<b>0.017</b>
J60+*J20-59	4.463	1	4.463	4.207	<b>0.043</b>
JTeen*J20-59	8.031	1	8.031	9.725	<b>0.003</b>

Of the 11 statistically significant pairings, 8 included the JTeen group, 6 the J20-59 group, 4 ForeignVis, two for J60+ and one for RepeatVis. The most significant values were recorded for FOOD\_GOOD across pairings ForeignVis\*JTeen, JTeen\*J60+, and JTeen\*J20-59 ( $p=0$ ). Powerful arguments for rejecting the  $H_0$  could also be made for the item GUIDES in respect of pairings ForeignVis\*J20-59 ( $p=0.007$ ) and JTeen\*J20-59 ( $p=0.009$ ). ORGANISED was also highly significant for JTeen\*J20-59 ( $p=0.003$ ) but less so for ForeignVis\*JTeen ( $p=0.05$ ). RIGHT and MOUTH also indicated significance for pairings between J20-59 and JTeen and J60+ respectively. These results

are reproduced in cross-tabulated form in Table 6. Empty cells indicate pairings with no significant item differences.

Table 6. Items showing significance between demographic group pairings ( $df=1$ )

	<b>JTeen</b>	<b>J20-59</b>	<b>J60+</b>	<b>ForeignVis</b>	<b>RepeatVis</b>
<b>JTeen</b>	X				
<b>J20-59</b>	Guides, Organized, Food_Good, Right, Mouth	X			
<b>J60+</b>	Food_Good	Mouth	X		
<b>ForeignVis</b>	Organized, Food_Good	Guides		X	
<b>RepeatVis</b>				Food_Good	X

## 7. Discussion

In our previous research into *gakuensai* visitor satisfaction we concluded that festival organizers should make contingencies to answer the needs of the demographic composition of participants (Iwamoto, Williams, and Uchiyama, 2015, p.12). The current research examines this issue by looking at the way in which satisfaction is expressed by different demographic groups.

The descriptive data and factor analysis presented in Tables 1 and 2 confirmed that the age, gender, repeat visit rate and ratio of Japanese to non-Japanese were very similar at *Koryu Day* in 2014 and 2015. Furthermore, the spread of the measure of satisfaction as indicated by the standard deviation also showed close agreement with our previous year's investigation. Despite these similar profiles, there was a difference in the *make-up* of foreign visitors. In 2014, the majority of foreign visitors were Josai University students who were mostly Chinese nationals. These students had often been encouraged to come to the festival by friends or the university itself, and were not voluntary visitors. in the sense Ryan (1995) describes as necessary for being a leisure visitor. In 2015 however foreign visitors were from a number of different South East Asian countries and had willingly joined a concurrent 3-weeks' study program at JIU and were equally willing in their decision to participate in

the *gakuensai*. In this sense, the foreign students in 2015 may have exhibited a stronger innate motivation to participate than in previous years.

As Ryan (1995) states however motivation can only be a part of the explanation. Descriptive factor analysis revealed that although, in general, participants attached high satisfaction to value and loyalty factors, this satisfaction was not matched by strong participant satisfaction with information services or the program itself. Information services such as promotion, publicity, or pamphlets are purposely designed to motivate attendance or participation and since satisfaction for these was low we may need to look elsewhere to explain the high overall satisfaction we uncovered for items such as RIGHT, HAPPY, and POSITIVE. We would like to suggest that the answer to this comes from a confluence of “flow” factors (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975) that are independent of motivation itself and come from the *act of truly* participating and contributing to the *gakuensai*.

Visiting ASEAN students’ involvement as participants rather than visitors was greatly increased at KD 2015. These students were given the chance to present their own culture through cultural performances and exhibits to other festival attendees, and did so enthusiastically. We believe it is the value of this *involvement* that is a key to understanding overall satisfaction with KD 2015. This satisfaction may derive not only from the act of real participation but may also come from a notion of *cooperation* and *togetherness* that students felt during festival activities. Foreign students participated with friends and acquaintances from their home universities and consequently a natural spirit of togetherness would have been easy to reproduce. The same effect of ‘true participation’, ‘involvement’ and ‘togetherness’ can also be applied to the Japanese teenage respondents – many of whom were performers at KD 2015 – to explain their very high overall satisfaction scores. Clearly further research is required but we would like to suggest that “involvement”, “togetherness”, and the “act of participation” could be keys to understanding satisfaction and its flow rather than the more one-dimensional approach that motivation proposes.

The between group factor analysis revealed even more detail. On the one hand it flagged up the universal dissatisfaction felt by participants concerning pre-festival information and during festival pamphlets, but on the other highlighted their happiness at having attended the festival and a general positivity towards the festival experience. Again we see an apparent mutual exclusivity between poorly evaluated information services and participants overall satisfaction with the *gakuensai*.

The statistically significant differences between groups of Japanese nationals of different ages (see Table 6) are of particular interest. Differences concerning festival organization may derive for example from a difference in perception, with younger less experienced visitors more easily satisfied. The differences between groups concerning guiding services is also important when we consider that *Koryu Day* is held at a department teaching tourism studies. The results suggest that guides may have been overly conscious of a perceived need to deliver such services to foreign visitors at the expense of

local ones. Although it appears that foreign visitors very much appreciate such a response, as it provides a chance for cross cultural communication, this may have come at the price of delivering a less than satisfactory service to locals - the most likely repeat visitors. To gain maximum satisfaction flow across all demographic groups providers of such services need to consider any conflicting issues and address them appropriately.

Food, and satisfaction of it, is a key to the success of the *gakuensai*. The current research showed how a wide age range of visitors from different cultural backgrounds may affect such satisfaction. The differences found between foreign visitors and Japanese visitors may be the result of a lack of knowledge of what “festival food” constitutes on the part of the former. If so, festivals like the *gakuensai* need better food interpretation. Satisfaction relating to food may also have been lowered by the relatively high cost felt by foreign visitors when comparing to their Japanese counterparts. Statistically significant differences between the younger Japanese and the over 60s age group concerning food further highlight the problems festivals have in satisfying within-culture groups of different ages. Providing food with a nostalgia element might be one way to attract the older demographic to festival food and thus increase overall festival satisfaction.

Finally, the idea of spreading news about festivals is vital to their future success through repeat visits (Byrd, Beedle, Cardinas, 2014). The current research shows there are some considerations that need to be made by festival organizers for within-culture groups in this respect. The difference in the use of social media across the within-culture demographic spectrum is important as younger participants are much keener to express their views on platforms such as Twitter or Facebook than the older generation. Where a festival is a success such activity can be of great benefit to repeat visitor rates.

Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004) and Mohr, Backman, Gahan and Backman (1993) indicate there is no one single explanation for satisfaction levels for within-culture groups of different ages or for groups with different cultural origins. The discussion here agrees with this thesis with the caveat that the factor analysis adopted here cannot take all the issues or “antecedents” into consideration when measuring satisfaction. One possible solution would be to adopt a Rasch type weighting analysis of data in any future studies.

These arguments notwithstanding factor analysis and ANOVA analyses carried out in the current research have been effective in determining factors (i.e. “antecedents”) that may contribute to university festival satisfaction including ‘involvement’, ‘cooperation’ and ‘togetherness’. At the same we have revealed how knowledge of the differences between demographic groups can help us to consider antecedents that may direct the total satisfaction “flow”.

## 8. Conclusion

As Japan globalizes its tourism profile further, small scale local festival tourism can act as a means not only to attract visitors from abroad to peripheral areas but also as a means to rejuvenate economically fragile local areas. Despite this positive message, the results of the current research do issues a warning to managers and organizers of small-local festivals like the *gakuensai*. This is that an understanding of the different needs and demands of a diverse visitor demographic is vital to ensuring festival success, repeat visits and sustainability. Moreover, a knowledge of motivation factors alone may be insufficient to understanding satisfaction is implicit in this warning. Instead it is likely that an understanding of a combination of factors or “antecedents” may be necessary.

As the current research suggests there are some differences in the way foreign and Japanese visitors appear to derive satisfaction at the *gakuensai*. Additionally results indicate that understanding the intercultural dimensions of satisfaction “flow” are essential to ensure the success of festivals where culturally distant participants interact. The corollary however is that not all Japanese visitors have the same homogenous needs. On the contrary, as the current research shows, the most significant differences in satisfaction were found between within-culture nationals (i.e. Japanese) of different age ranges rather than between foreign visitors and Japanese ones. Therefore, the results of the current paper help to understand not only what makes visitors satisfied with visiting the *gakuensai*, but also shows the differences between foreign and Japanese visitors, and also between different groups of Japanese.

The implication for the marketing and promotion of such local events and festivals is the strong need to adopt a strategic and holistic approach that can produce an attractive festival of high quality and encourage repeat visits from both Japanese and non-Japanese of all ages. In this way, festival tourism in Japanese localities can become globally aware and have a locally relevant agenda to aid local and national tourism development.

## 9. Limitations and future research

Although the current paper examined the satisfaction of visitors to a university festival (*gakuensai*) in a more thorough manner than our previous research, limitations in our conclusions remain. Due to the relatively small sample size (N=140) we were unable to divide student visitors into separate demographic groups such as ‘ASEAN students’ and ‘exchange students’. In view of the difference in length of sojourn between the two groups such a demarcation may have been instructive to our results. In addition, a more detailed assessment of gender differences in the sample would be of great utility to understanding a key dimension of visitor demography. In future, one means to solve these two issues might be to adopt a stratified, or positive sampling technique that can provide researchers with distinct

demographic groupings that can be compared more accurately and may provide more salient results.

## References

- Akiyoshi, I. (2013). Research on the economic effect caused by sightseeing consumption at the 5<sup>th</sup> Himeji international short film festival, 2012. *Journal of the University of Hyogo*, 65(1), 25-40.
- Ashkenazi, M. (1990). Festival management and the corporate analysis of Japanese society. In E. Ben Ari et al. (eds.). *Unwrapping Japan*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 205-20.
- Baker, D. A., & Crompton, J. L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 785-804.
- Blešić, I., Pivac, T., Stamenković, I., & Besermenji, S. (2013). Motives of visits to ethno music festivals with regard to gender and age structure of visitors. *Event Management*, 17(2), 145-154.
- Boone, H. N., & Boone D. A. (2012). Analyzing Likert Data. *Journal of Extension*, 50(2). Available at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/2012april/tt2p.shtml>
- Byrd, R. T., Beedle, J., & Cardenas, D. A. (2014). Repeat visitation and visitor spending at events: Hogs and muscle cars. *Event Management*, 18(2), 101-110.
- Crompton, J., & McKay, S. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425-439.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety*. London: Jossey Bass.
- Esu, B. B., & Arrey, V. M. (2009). Tourists' satisfaction with cultural tourism festival: a case study of Calabar Carnival Festival, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(3), 16-25.
- Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, 29, 403-428.
- Iwamoto, H., Williams, D. A., & Uchiyama, T. (2015). Visitors at a university festival: a preliminary case study of visitor satisfaction. *Bulletin of Josai International University*, 23(6), 1-15.
- Kim, N., Ahn, Y. J., & Wicks, B. E. (2014). Local festival quality and the application of a revised importance–performance analysis: The case of the Jirisan Cheon-Wang Festival. *Event Management*, 18(2), 89-100.
- Kozak, M. 2001. Comparative assessment of tourist satisfaction with destinations across two nationalities. *Tourism Management*, 22(4), 391-401.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. (2010). Question and Questionnaire Design. In “Handbook of Survey Research”, J.D. Wright and P.V. Marsden (Eds.), West Yorkshire, England: Emerald, 263-313.
- Lee, C. K., Lee, Y. K., & Wicks, B. E. (2004). Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 25(1), 61-70.
- McKercher, B., Mei, W. S., & Tse, T. S. (2006). Are short duration cultural festivals tourist attractions? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(1), 55-66.
- Meng, F., Tepanon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2008). Measuring tourist satisfaction by attribute and motivation: the case

- of a nature-based resort. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 14(1), 41-56.
- Minamizono, T., Kaneko, Y., Minamizono, S., & Motohashi, Y. (2013). Association of festival observance with psychological distress in a rural Japanese community. *Open Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 3(5), 368-373.
- Mohr, K., Backman, K., Gahan, L., & Backman, S. (1993). An investigation of festival motivations and event satisfaction by visitor type. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 1(3), 89-97.
- Morishita, Y. (2014). Research on urban community building in Sapporo: challenges and implications of a local festival. *Hokkaido University Journal of Graduate School of Letters*, 9, 29-39.
- Nield, K., Kozak, M., & Legrys, G. (2000). The role of food in tourist satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Marketing*, 19(4), 375-384.
- Niori, N. (2012). Constructing Okinawan Identities: focusing on the surveys of the participants of the 5<sup>th</sup> worldwide *uchinanchu* festival. University of the Ryukyus, *Immigration Studies*, 8, 1-22.
- Ryan, C. (1995). Tourist satisfaction – concepts and research issues. In C. Ryan (eds.). *Researching tourist satisfaction*. London: Routledge
- Scott, D. (1996). A comparison of visitors' motivations to attend three urban festivals. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(3), 121-128.
- Sparks, B. (2007). Planning a wine vacation? Factors that help to predict tourist behavior intentions. *Tourism Management*, 28(5), 1180-1192
- Yoon, Y. S., Lee, J. S., & Lee, C. K. (2010). Measuring festival quality and value affecting visitors' satisfaction and loyalty using a structural approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(2), 335-342.
- 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.