How Festival Experience Quality Influence Visitor Satisfaction? A Quantitative Approach

Suzana Marković
University of Rijeka, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management Opatija, Croatia
suzanam@fthm.hr

ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC PAPER

RECEIVED: OCTOBER 2019

REVISED: NOVEMBER 2019

ACCEPTED: DECEMBER 2019

DOI: 10.2478/ngoe-2019-0019

UDK: 338.48:7.091.4:311.17

JEL: L83, Z32

Citation: Marković, S. (2019). How Festival Experience Quality Influence Visitor Satisfaction? A Quantitative Approach. *Naše gospodarstvo/Our Economy, 65*(4), 47–56. DOI: 10.2478/ngoe-2019-0019

Abstract

The purpose of research presented in this paper is to determine how selected characteristics of a city event affect the satisfaction of visitors. In particular, the aim is to identify factors related to event atmospherics that determine visitor satisfaction in the city destination in continental part of Croatia. For this purpose, questionnaire was created based on previously conducted research by Bitner (1992), Oliver (1980, 1997), Baker and Crompton (2000), and Lee, Lee, Lee, and Babin (2008). It comprised measures for assessing event atmospherics, visitor satisfaction, and demographic characteristics of the respondents. The research was conducted among visitors of a city event that takes place every year during December 2018. A total of 191 questionnaires were obtained during the one-month period. Principal component analysis was utilised to determine the factor structure of city event atmospherics. In addition, multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine which factors may serve as predictors of visitor satisfaction in city event context. As a result, the analyses revealed four factors related to city event atmospherics. In addition, these factors positively and significantly affected visitor satisfaction, indicating that they have important role in determining visitor satisfaction in a city event context. These findings can contribute to the knowledge advancement of the city events, their influence on tourist satisfaction, and consequently, to better understand specific groups of visitors as well as establish efficient marketing and promotion strategies.

Keywords: experience, event experience, visitor satisfaction, multivariate statistical analysis, event tourism

Introduction

In fast growing experience economy, customers are changing their desires and expectations, seeking for more variety and customisation than they used to in the past. Nowadays, consumers are in search of experiences that 'dazzle their senses', 'engage them personally', 'touch their hearts' and 'stimulate their minds' (Schmitt, 1999) whilst indulging in 'fantasies, feelings and fun' (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982). As a result, numerous authors have underlined the relevance of creating extraordinary customer experiences as a strategy to create value, to give companies a sustainable competitive advantage and to foster customers' satisfaction, loyalty and positive word-of-mouth (Pine & Gilmore, 1998; Berry, Carbone, & Haeckel, 2002; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Shaw & Ovens, 2005; Naylor, Kleiser, Baker, & Yorkston, 2008).

NG
OE

**NAŠE GOSPODARSTVO
OUR ECONOMY**

Vol. 65 No. 4 2019

pp. 47–56

In recent years, a consensus has emerged that characterises customer experience as a multidimensional evaluation, where different dimensions or factors contribute to form a 'holistic' view (Schmitt, 1999; Gentile, Spiller, & Noci, 2007; Kim, Cha, Knutson, & Beck, 2011), although these dimensions may be difficult to isolate, expensive to orchestrate and beyond the company's control (Verhoef et al., 2009). This challenges companies to design, manage and measure customers' experiences (Maklan & Klaus, 2011).

Most studies on customer experience are essentially conceptual or descriptive (Chang & Hong, 2010) and fail to capture the complexity of content-specific variables and its impact on experience quality and marketing outcomes (Palmer, 2010; Lemke, Clark, & Wilson, 2011). In fact, experience is a broader and less delimited concept than product or service quality. Thus, the development of experience measurement scales is a research opportunity, which would allow a broader understanding on what factors are more important in order to create positive customer experiences, with benefits for management practices.

Therefore, this research has two objectives: *firstly*, to explore how visitors perceive particular city event and to examine factors that best explain event atmospherics, and *secondly*, to identify which factors related to event atmospherics determine visitor satisfaction in the context of city destination in continental part of Croatia.

The paper is divided into five sections. After the introduction, the main findings from literature review regarding main concepts of interest are presented. The third section describes research methodology, including the research objectives and hypothesis, research instrument, data collection, and data analysis. Results of empirical research are provided in the fourth section, followed by main research conclusions.

Theoretical Background

As the field of event tourism is relatively new, dynamic and constantly developing, a critical review of the literature currently available is required to support and validate the proposed research. Literature relating to experience quality and event experience will be critically reviewed.

The Concept of Experience

This research focuses on event experiences as distinct from our day-to-day experiences, happening outside the context of 'normal' life (Walls, Okumus, Wang, & Kwun, 2011). Experiences in general are seen as a sharp contrast to everyday life (Pine & Gilmore, 1998) and leisure and tourist experiences are often viewed as unique and special (Manell & Iso-Ahola, 1987), extraordinary (Morgan, Lugosi, & Ritchie, 2010) or 'peak experiences' (Quan & Wang, 2004), taking place outside the 'usual environment' and 'contracted time' (Volo, 2010). Experiences have been conceptualised in a variety of ways, including approaches based on motivations for experiences (Elands & Lengkeek, 2000), such as Cohen's (1979) tourists' experiences modes, or Vespestad and Lindberg's (2011) nature-based tourism experience categories.

Tourism experiences were often studied with respect to tourists' involvement or engagement with the destination/tourist site, including physical involvement, such as leisure activities and emotional involvement, such as self-concept/expression (Gross & Brown, 2008; Han & Patterson, 2007; Voigt, Howat, & Brown, 2010). Based on physical and emotional involvements, more specific attributes, which serve as the core components of tourism experiences have been developed and used for understanding leisure tourists' on-site experiences (Pearce et al., 2013). According to Pearce et al. (2013), tourism experiences consisted of five major components, namely, sensory (e.g. smell and sight), relationship (social interaction at the site), behavioural (preferences of tourism activities), cognitive (cognitive appraisal of the site) and affective (affective response to the place). In addition, tourism experiences were studied in different forms, such as activity-based (Vespestad & Lindberg, 2011; Voigt et al, 2010), emotional-involvement-based (Gross & Brown, 2006), sensory with the physical attributes and atmosphere of the place (Slatten & Mehmetoglu, 2009), service-quality-based (Wong & Tong, 2012) and people-interaction-based (Ciolfi, 2007). Thus, these previous studies suggest that tourism experience is multi-dimensional.

The Concept of Event Experience

Although there have been a number of conceptual studies of the tourist experience, the literature on event experiences fragmented, under-studied and under-conceptualised, with focus commonly on motivations, satisfaction and economic impacts. There exists little to no linkage between the sparse conceptual discussion and real-life practices, justifying the researcher's intention to create a useful and tangible academic link.

The experience economy has directly influenced the modern festival industry, with attendees craving 'nuanced, unique and refreshed experiences (to help them) achieve new levels of personal accomplishment and enrichment' (Yeoman, 2013). Events have often been conceptualised

as 'special' or unique types of experience (Getz, 2012). Planned event experiences and the meanings attached to them are the core phenomenon of event studies (Getz, 2012) and it is recognised that special event experiences should be unique, fluid, engaging and memorable, creating an ever-changing perceptual novelty (Schmitt, 1999). Beard (2014) highlighted the importance role of creative event programming in facilitating engaging and memorable attendee experiences.

This research focuses on event experience or extraordinary experiences in staged events and festival settings. The term 'event' or 'special event' (Getz, 1989) is used to describe a wide range of phenomena, ranging from mega events to community festivals and local events, all of which have quite different characteristics (Getz, 2005). Events have been defined as a onetime or infrequently occurring event of limited duration that provides the consumer with a leisure and social opportunity beyond everyday experience (Jago & Shaw, 1998). Their special appeal stems from the innate uniqueness of each event, which differentiates them from fixed attractions and their 'ambience', which elevates them above ordinary life (Getz, 1989). Van Vliet (2012) defined festivals as a gathering of a relatively large crowd in a specific public area for a delineated period, during which visitors are offered a unique experience (planned and organized with a specific purposes), including transformation and play elements, making it possible for visitors to behave and feel differently than in their daily lives.

Both definitions encompass music, sports, cultural and arts events. They are bound in space and time, and therefore are very suitable for the study of discrete experiences.

The challenges in defining festivals lies in differentiating festivals from events and special events. Festival research originated as part of event studies and has only recently emerged as a distinct field of study. Consequently, prior studies have not always made a clear distinction between festivals and events. It has been argued that key differences between festivals and other events are festivals' central focus on celebration of cultural and social dimensions, and the involvement of multiple stakeholders (Getz, 2012). Festivals differ from special events as they occur on a regular basis, whereas 'a special event is a onetime or infrequently occurring event outside the normal range/ programme or activities of the sponsoring or organising body' (Getz, 1997).

Experience Outcomes

Experiences produce outcomes, such as satisfaction, emotions, cognition and behaviour. After all, the individual is also affected by the experience (Snell, 2011) and researchers agree that experiences trigger a multitude of emotion, physical, cognitive and spiritual recreation (Pine & Gilmore, 1998, 1999; Walls et al., 2011).

Satisfaction is an experiential outcome that has been widely researched in marketing and management, where leisure experiences are regarded as consumer experiences. Tourist satisfaction is defined as 'a collection of tourists' attitudes about specific domains in the vacationing experience' (Pizam, Neumann, & Reichel, 1978) and is considered to be one of the key judgments that tourists make regarding a tourism service (Song & Cheung, 2010). One common way to measure experiences in the managerial perspectives is to analyse service quality perceptions (Quan & Wang, 2004) and satisfaction (Otto & Ritchie, 1996).

Experiences also stimulate senses and evokes emotions (Gupta & Vajic, 1999). Experiences encompass multiple sensory dimensions (tastes, sounds, colours and scents; Gretzel at al., 2006) and sensations (Gupta & Vajic, 1999). In addition, previous research (Hosany & Gilbert, 2010) used emotional measures to capture tourism and leisure experiences.

To conclude, event experiences are viewed as a process: when certain conditions are met, an experience can occur, resulting in multiple outcomes. This experience has cognitive, conative and affective components.

Research Methodology

The purpose of the research was to determine how selected attributes of a city event affect the visitors' satisfaction. In particular, the objectives were to identify factors related to event atmospherics, and to assess their effects on visitor satisfaction at the Zagreb Christmas Market.

In order to meet research objectives, the following hypothesis is proposed:
Event atmospherics attributes have positive and significant effect on visitor satisfaction.

An empirical research was based on primary data, collected with on-site questionnaire. The survey instrument contained three main parts. The first section was designed to measure event atmospherics, using multiple-item scale with 22 items. Measures were adopted from the literature on service environment (Bitner, 1992; Lee et al., 2008) and the literature relating to festivals (Baker & Crompton, 2000). A 7-point scale with anchors 'very poor' (as 1) and 'excellent' (as 7) was utilised to measure these items.

The second section measured the visitors' satisfaction was assessed by adopting measures suggested by Oliver (1980, 1997). The construct consisted of eight items. These measures encompass cognitive and affective aspects of overall satisfaction. The level of agreement with these items was rated using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' (as 1) to 'strongly agree' (as 7).

The third section of the instrument was designed to measure demographic characteristics of the respondents, which included: gender, age, number of previous visits, level of education, country of residence, marital status, number of people in group, and length of stay.

The research was conducted in December 2018 among visitors of at various sites at the Zagreb Christmas Market. The questionnaires were distributed to those visitors who were willing to participate in the research. Participation was voluntary, and no incentives were given to the respondents. Thus, the data were collected using a convenience sampling approach. A total of 191 usable questionnaires were collected during the one-month period.

Statistical analysis was carried out as follows. Descriptive statistics was used to describe respondents' characteristics, as well as to evaluate event atmospherics and visitor satisfaction. Principal component analysis was utilised to determine the factor structure of city event atmospherics. The reliability of the event atmospherics scale was tested with Cronbach alpha coefficients. In addition, multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine which event atmospherics factors may serve as predictors of visitor satisfaction in city event context.

In addition, to ensure that questionnaire measures what is intended to be measured, validity of the questionnaire was examined. Firstly, content validity was established by addressing literature review to extract the items related to the event atmospherics construct and satisfaction construct. Secondly, construct validity was assessed with testing the degree to which construct variables that theoretically should be related, are in fact related. Analysis showed that correlation coefficients between all 22 variables in event atmospherics construct vary from 0.498 to 0.788, with $p < 0.01$, indicating significant moderate to strong inter-item relationship. What is more, correlation coefficients between 8 variables in satisfaction construct vary from 0.711 to 0.917, with $p < 0.01$, indicating strong inter-item relationship, as well. It can be concluded that questionnaire in present research meets validity criteria.

Research Results

The results are reported in several sections. Firstly, characteristics of the respondents are presented. Next, event atmospherics attributes are described, followed by visitor satisfaction description. Finally, relationship between event atmospherics factors and visitors' satisfaction with the event is examined.

Characteristics of Respondents

The sample consisted of 191 domestic visitors. There were more females (71.2 per cent) than males (28.8 per cent). An average age of the respondents was approximately 30. In terms of level of education, most of the respondents indicated that they had completed secondary school (43.4 per cent) or had graduated from university (28.8 per cent). Most respondents in the sample were in a relationship (42.4 per cent), single (34 per cent) or married (23 per cent). In terms of personal income, nearly half of the respondents (44.5 per cent) reported middle, and about 26 per cent indicated their personal income as upper middle or high.

Concerning respondents' visit characteristics, majority of the respondents (62.8 per cent) were repeat visitors that have visited the event three or more times. The most popular information source regarding the event was Internet and social media (46.7 per cent), followed by word-of-mouth recommendation from friends and relatives (35.7 per cent) and TV/radio commercials (13.6 per cent). Primary purpose of visiting the location was attending the event (73.8 per cent). Some of the respondents indicated visiting friends and relatives (10.5 per cent) as purpose of visit, while 9.4 per cent of them reported that they were just passing through. Most respondents were accompanied, visiting the event in a group of 3 to 5 people (47.6 per cent), and stayed only one day at the location (60.2 per cent).

Event Atmospherics Attributes

The results of descriptive statistics for event atmospherics attributes are provided in Table 1.

Mean scores for event atmospherics scale ranged from 3.50 to 6.17. The lowest score was appointed to the item 'availability of restrooms', while the highest score was given to the item 'visually appealing decorations'. Overall, respondents positively evaluated most event atmospherics items (mean scores greater than 5). Two items, namely 'easy access to parking lots' and 'availability of restrooms', were evaluated negatively (mean scores lower than 4). On the other hand, respondents were neutral regarding the following items: 'affordable', 'availability of proper signs for site directions',

Table 1. Event atmospherics attributes descriptive analysis (N=191)

Items	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Availability of activities/programmes for all ages	5.85	1.179
2. Quality of entertainment	5.73	1.226
3. Uniqueness of themed activities/programs	5.42	1.339
4. Availability of types of food/refreshments	5.81	1.446
5. Quality of food/refreshments	5.41	1.455
6. Availability of various souvenirs/products	5.66	1.300
7. Feeling of safety on site	5.98	1.225
8. Affordable	4.33	1.566
9. Visually appealing decorations	6.17	1.254
10. Easy access to parking lots	3.60	1.635
11. Availability of restrooms	3.50	1.704
12. Availability of proper signs for site directions	4.99	1.476
13. Enough available information (e.g. event programmes, food venues, etc.)	5.13	1.454
14. Enough available information (e.g. event programmes, food venues, etc.)	5.80	1.270
15. Cleanliness of the site	5.56	1.246
16. Safe and well-maintained equipment and facilities	5.61	1.213
17. Acceptable crowd level	5.40	1.573
18. Attentive staff who willingly respond to me requests	5.59	1.346
19. Friendly and courteous staff	5.74	1.331
20. Staff's willingness to help visitors	5.69	1.296
21. Knowledgeable staff in response to my requests	5.73	1.264
22. Availability of prompt services	5.32	1.376
Overall	*5.36*	

Note: mean scores range from 1 to 7.

'availability of various souvenirs/products', 'enough available information (e.g. event programmes, food venues, etc.)'.

Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was conducted on the 22 items to identify the main factors of event atmospherics construct. The appropriateness for conducting the analysis was evaluated with KMO Test and Bartlett's Test. KMO value was high, and Bartlett's test was significant, thus the data was suitable to identify factor structure for event atmospherics scale.

As reported in Table 2, the 22 items were reduced to four factor solution that explained 70,683 per cent of the total variance in the data. In addition, eigenvalues ranged from 2.512 to 5.161, factor loadings were high (from 0.512 to 0.849), and all extracted factors contained at least three items. Hence, the rule of thumb for satisfactory factor solution, as suggested by Hair et al. (2010) was met. The four factors were labelled as 'staff service quality' (factor 1), 'event offerings and programmes' (factor 2), 'event area' (factor 3), and 'convenience and accessibility of facilities' (factor 4).

Furthermore, factor analysis results additionally addressed and confirmed the construct validity that was previously examined and reported in the research methodology section of the paper. Since factor loadings are well above the 0.4, eigenvalues are greater than 1, and there was no cross-loading of items above 0.4, the cut-off values for satisfying the criteria of construct validity, as suggested by Taherdoost (2016), were met.

Next, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for all factors, and showed adequate internal consistency of the factors (values ranged from 0.782 to 0.932). In addition, Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the overall event atmospherics scale was 0.947, and according to Hair et al. (2010) indicates its high reliability.

Visitor Satisfaction

The items in the construct of visitor satisfaction are divided in cognitive satisfaction items (items 1 to 5) and in affective

Table 2. Factor and reliability analyses of event atmospherics attributes

Factor/Items	Factor loadings	% of Variance	Cronbach alpha
Factor 1 (6 items)		*21.933*	*0.932*
EA20 – staff's willingness to help visitors	0.849		
EA21 – knowledgeable staff in response to my requests	0.840		
EA19 – friendly and courteous staff	0.837		
EA18 – attentive staff who willingly respond to my requests	0.770		
EA22 – availability of prompt services	0.722		
EA17 – acceptable crowd level	0.602		
Factor 2 (7 items)		*19.026*	*0.882*
EA2 – quality of entertainment	0.764		
EA3 – uniqueness of themed activities/programs	0.701		
EA9 – visually appealing decorations	0.701		
EA4 – availability of types of food/refreshments	0.664		
EA1 – availability of activities/programmes for all ages	0.653		
EA6 – availability of various souvenirs/products	0.603		
EA5 – quality of food/refreshments	0.578		
Factor 3 (6 items)		*16.022*	*0.872*
EA12 – availability of proper signs for site directions	0.687		
EA15 – cleanliness of the site	0.677		
EA16 – safe and well-maintained equipment and facilities	0.664		
EA13 – acceptable crowd level	0.654		
EA7 – feeling of safety on site	0.570		
EA14 – enough available information	0.560		
Factor 4 (3 items)		*10.929*	*0.782*
EA10 – easy access to parking lots	0.835		
EA11 – availability of restrooms	0.772		
EA8 - affordable	0.512		
Total		*70.683*	*0.947*
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)	0.912		
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	3217.504 ($p < 0.01$)		

Note: Extraction Method – Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method – Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

satisfaction items (items 6 to 8). The results of descriptive statistics for visitor satisfaction items are presented in Table 3.

Mean scores for visitor satisfaction scale ranged from 5.54 to 6.00, indicating respondents' high levels of satisfaction. Comparing the mean scores for cognitive and affective satisfaction items, results revealed that affective evaluation of the event was slightly higher than cognitive evaluation of the event (mean values were 5.75 and 5.92, respectively). Overall mean score for satisfaction scale showed that respondents were fairly satisfied with their visit of the event.

Multiple Regression Analysis

The main research hypothesis was tested with multiple regression analysis. For this purpose, factors extracted in factor analysis deemed as independent variables, while overall visitor satisfaction was applied as dependent variable.

Firstly, correlation was run to determine direction of relationship between the individual event atmospherics factors and overall visitor satisfaction, as well as to examine possible multicollinearity of variables in the model.

Table 3. Descriptive statistical analysis of visitor satisfaction attributes (N=191)

Items	Mean	Standard deviation
1. My choice to visit this Christmas market was a wise one.	5.98	1.287
2. I am sure it was the right decision to visit this Christmas market.	6.00	1.342
3. My experience at this Christmas market was what I expected.	5.95	1.211
4. This was one of the best Christmas markets I have ever visited.	5.68	1.586
5. My experience at this Christmas market was exactly what I needed.	5,54	1.575
6. I am satisfied with my decision to visit this Christmas market.	5.92	1.445
7. This Christmas market made me feel happy.	5.75	1.480
8. I really enjoyed myself at this Christmas market.	5.82	1.452
Overall mean		

Note: mean scores range from 1 to 7.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Factor 1	5.58	1.182	1.000			
2. Factor 2	5.72	1.008	0.649	1.000		
3. Factor 3	5.51	1.030	0.699	0.704	1.000	
4. Factor 4	3.81	1.366	0.549	0.523	0.556	1.000
5. Overall customer satisfaction	5.83	1.299	0.655	0.768	0.675	0.453

Note: mean ranges from 1 to 7; SD – standard deviation; all correlation coefficients are significant at 0.01 level.

Table 5. A multiple regression analysis

Model fit	
Multiple R	0.803
R^2	0.645
Adjusted R^2	0.637
Standard error	0.782
F ratio	84.494
Significance	0.000

Independent variable	b	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	0.439		1.254	0.212
Factor 1	0.228	0.208	3.152	0.002*
Factor 2	0.678	0.084	8.035	0.000*
Factor 3	0.227	0.180	2.560	0.011**
Factor 4	0.034	0.036	0.648	0.518

Note: Dependent variable: overall customer satisfaction; * - significant at 0.01 level; **- significant at 0.05 level

Correlation matrix reviled positive, moderate to strong, and statistically significant intercorrelations in the model. The strongest correlation with overall visitor satisfaction variable had factor 2 'event offerings and programmes' ($r = 0.768$, $p < 0.01$), followed by factor 3 'event area' ($r = 0.675$, $p < 0.01$), factor 1 'staff service quality' ($r = 0.655$, $p < 0.01$), and factor 4 'convenience and accessibility of facilities' ($r = 0.453$, $p < 0.01$).

Since correlation coefficients (Table 4) did not exceed cut-off value of 0.80, as recommended by Bryman and Cramer (2009), multicollinearity problem did not occur in this research, so it was appropriate to continue with multiple regression analysis.

According to the results presented in Table 5, the relationship between the combination of independent variables in

the model and dependent variable is strong (R = 0.803). In addition, the R^2 value indicates that four independent variables explained 64.5 per cent of variance in the dependent variable. Significant F-ratio ($F = 84.494$, $p < 0.01$) suggested that the model statistically significantly predicted dependent variable.

To evaluate the impact of each independent variable on dependent variable, unstandardized (b) and standardised (beta) coefficients are provided. As seen in table 5, factor 1 'staff service quality', factor 2 'event offerings and programmes', and factor 3 'event area' have significant relationships with overall visitor satisfaction. Having unstandardized coefficients of 0.228, 0.678, and 0.227 respectively, it means that every one-unit increase in 'staff service quality', there will be increase by 0.228 in overall visitor satisfaction. Accordingly, in every one-unit increase in 'event offerings and programmes', there will be increase by 0.678 in overall visitor satisfaction. As well as in every one-unit increase in 'event area', there will be increase by 0.227 in overall visitor satisfaction. On the other hand, factor 4 'convenience and accessibility of facilities' individually had no significant impact on overall visitor satisfaction ($p > 0.05$).

According to standardised (beta) coefficients, the most important independent variable with the highest statistically significant impact on overall visitor satisfaction was factor 1 'staff service quality' ($\beta = 0.208$, $p < 0.01$). This was followed by the factor 3 'event area' ($\beta = 0.180$, $p < 0.05$) and factor 2 'event offerings and programmes' ($\beta = 0.084$, $p < 0.01$). Factor 4 'convenience and accessibility of facilities' ($\beta = 0.036$, $p > 0.05$), had the smallest impact on overall visitor satisfaction. In addition, this impact was not statistically significant.

Conclusion and Implications

The present research reports how visitors perceive city event atmospherics, and what determines visitor satisfaction in the city event context.

The research results revealed that the construct of city event atmospherics is perceived through event offerings and programmes, staff service quality, event area and convenience and accessibility of facilities. Previous studies conducted in the event tourism sector identified somehow different outcomes with regard to the number and interpretation of factors that visitors use to assess the perceived experiences of a city event (Bitner, 1992; Lee et al., 2008; Yoon et al., 2010; Mason & Paggiaro, 2012; Anil, 2012). Therefore, it is necessary to modify factors that fit research context.

According to the results of multiple regression analysis, the regression model predicted the dependent variable significantly well. It means that four event atmospherics factors simultaneously have significant and positive influence on visitor satisfaction in a city event environment. These results imply that highly perceived event offerings and programmes, staff service quality, event area, and convenience and accessibility of facilities lead to higher overall visitor satisfaction with the event. Thus, the main research hypothesis is confirmed.

What is more, it has been identified that staff service quality, event offerings and programmes as well as event area projected the strongest significant impacts on visitor satisfaction. Thus, availability of different activities, variety of products and entertainment possibilities, gastronomy, as well as cleanliness, number of visitors and feeling of safety are the most important predictors of city event visitor satisfaction.

Based on these findings, event managers and local community decision makers who want to increase the level of visitor satisfaction with city event should emphasise both tangible and intangible factors of the event. Although factor 'convenience and accessibility of facilities' individually had no significant contribution to overall visitor satisfaction in the tested model, these results provide event practitioners with opportunities for improvement and growth.

This research has both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, it extends the literature of event tourism by exploring the relationship between visitors' perceptions of city event atmospherics and their satisfaction. Practically, it provides event managers a better understanding of visitors' reactions to city event that attracts both local and nonlocal visitors. By understanding how visitors perceive city event attributes, event managers and local community decision makers would be able to create better designed programmes and offerings, thus enhancing visitor satisfaction, and consequently positive behavioural intentions.

When considering the reported results, some limitations should be noted. The results are limited to specific city event and geographical area. Thus, broadening the research geographically to other cities where events of the same type are organised, may enhance research results. Another limitation refers to the focus on a specific event type or programme, thus results cannot be generalised to every city event. In addition, the convenience sampling procedure may have resulted with the sample that does not represent all the characteristics of the target population.

In order to broaden the contemporary literature related to the city event experience, future research should be conducted among event organisers, as well as local residents,

thus consequently gaining the perceptions from their point of view. Further, results of the present research could be compared to the results of similar research conducted in other city tourism sectors in order to provide local decision makers better understanding of how city visitors perceive all the city tourism sectors overall. Additionally, future research should examine a set of different city events simultaneously, thereby providing city event practitioners with a more comprehensive view of city event tourism. Finally, additional analysis could be performed to examine how relationship tested in present research differs among different groups in the same population (e.g. domestic versus foreign visitors, local versus nonlocal visitors, first-time versus repeat visitors). Furthermore, qualitative based studies could help to understand why visitors value certain experience dimensions more than others. Overall, this findings research enhances knowledge on the experience concept and offer important implications for service managers.

References

Anil, N.K. (2012). Festival visitors' satisfaction and loyalty: An example of small, local and municipality organized festival. *Turizam*, *60*(3), 255-271.

Baker, D. A., & Crompton, J. L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of tourism research*, *27*(3), 785-804. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5

Beard, C. (2014). Designing and mapping event experiences. *Strategic event creation*, 123-140.

Berry, L. L., Carbone, L. P., & Haeckel, S. H. (2002). Managing the total customer experience. *MIT Sloan management review*, *43*(3), 85-89.

Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. *Journal of marketing*, *56*(2), 57-71. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299205600205

Chang, T. Y., & Horng, S. C. (2010). Conceptualizing and measuring experience quality: the customer's perspective. *The Service industries journal*, *30*(14), 2401-2419. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060802629919

Ciolfi, L. (2007). Supporting affective experiences of place through interaction design. *CoDesign*, *3*(S1), 183-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/15710880701309308

Gentile, C., Spiller, N., & Noci, G. (2007). How to sustain the customer experience: An overview of experience components that co-create value with the customer? *European management journal*, *25*(5), 395-410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2007.08.005

Getz, D. (1989). Special events: Defining the product. *Tourism management*, *10*(2), 125-137. https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(89)90053-8

Getz, D. (1997). *Event Management and Event Tourism*. New York: Cognizant Communications.

Getz, D. (2012). *Event studies: Theory, research and policy for planned events*. London: Routledge.

Gross, M. J., & Brown, G. (2006). Tourism experiences in a lifestyle destination setting: The roles of involvement and place attachment. *Journal of business research*, *59*(6), 696-700. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2005.12.002

Gupta, S. & Vajic, M. (1999). *The contextual and dialectical nature of experiences*. In Fitzsimmons, J. & Fitzimmons, M. (eds.). New Service Development, CA: Sage.

Han, H., & Back, K. J. (2007). Assessing customers' emotional experiences influencing their satisfaction in the lodging industry. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *23*(1), 43-56. https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v23n01_04

Holbrook, M. B., & Hirschman, E. C. (1982). The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. *Journal of consumer research*, *9*(2), 132-140. https://doi.org/10.1086/208906

Hosany, S., & Gilbert, D. (2010). Measuring tourists' emotional experiences toward hedonic holiday destinations. *Journal of travel research*, *49*(4), 513-526. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287509349267

Jago, L. K., & Shaw, R. N. (1998). Special events: A conceptual and definitional framework. *Festival management and event tourism*, *5*(1-2), 21-32. https://doi.org/10.3727/106527098792186775

Kim, S., Cha, J., Knutson, B. J., & Beck, J. A. (2011). Development and testing of the Consumer Experience Index (CEI). *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, *21*(2), 112-132. https://doi.org/10.1108/09604521111113429

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.05.009

Lemke, F., Clark, M., & Wilson, H. (2011). Customer experience quality: an exploration in business and consumer contexts using repertory grid technique. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *39*(6), 846-869. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0219-0

Maklan, S., & Klaus, P. (2011). Customer experience: are we measuring the right things? *International Journal of Market Research*, *53*(6), 771-792. https://doi.org/10.2501/IJMR-53-6-771-792

Mannell, R. C., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1987). Psychological nature of leisure and tourism experience. *Annals of tourism research*, *14*(3), 314-331. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(87)90105-8

Morgan, M., Lugosi, P., & Ritchie, J. B. (Eds.). (2010). *The tourism and leisure experience: Consumer and managerial perspectives*, *44*. Channel View Publications. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781845411503

Naylor, G., Kleiser, S. B., Baker, J., & Yorkston, E. (2008). Using transformational appeals to enhance the retail experience. *Journal of Retailing*, *84*(1), 49-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2008.01.001

Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of marketing research*, *17*(4), 460-469. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378001700405

Oliver, R. L. (1997*). Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Palmer, A. (2010). Customer experience management: a critical review of an emerging idea. *Journal of Services marketing*, *24*(3), 196-208. https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041011040604

Pine, B. J., Pine, J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The experience economy: work is theatre & every business a stage*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard business review*, *76*, 97-105.

Pizam, A., Neumann, Y., & Reichel, A. (1978). Dimensions of tourist satisfaction with a destination area. *Annals of tourism Research*, *5*(3), 314-322. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(78)90115-9

Quan, S., & Wang, N. (2004). Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: An illustration from food experiences in tourism. *Tourism management*, *25*(3), 297-305. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00130-4

Schmitt, B. (1999). Experiential marketing. *Journal of marketing management*, *15*(1-3), 53-67. https://doi.org/10.1362/026725799784870496

Shaw, C., Ovens, J. (2005*). Building Great Customer Experience*. New York: McMillan.

Slåtten, T., Mehmetoglu, M., Svensson, G., & Sværi, S. (2009). Atmospheric experiences that emotionally touch customers: a case study from a winter park. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, *19*(6), 721-746. https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520911005099

Song, H., & Cheung, C. (2010). Attributes affecting the level of tourist satisfaction with and loyalty towards theatrical performance in China: Evidence from a qualitative study. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *12*(6), 665-679. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.782

Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and Reliability of the Research Instrument; How to test the Validation of a Questionnaire/Survey in a Research. *International Journal of Academic Research and Management, 5*(3), 28-36. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205040

Van Vliet, H. (2012). Festivals: Een introductie. *Festivalbeleving. De waarde van publieks evenementen*. Utrecht: Hogeschool Utrecht.

Verhoef, P. C., Lemon, K. N., Parasuraman, A., Roggeveen, A., Tsiros, M., & Schlesinger, L. A. (2009). Customer experience creation: Determinants, dynamics and management strategies. *Journal of retailing*, *85*(1), 31-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2008.11.001

Vespestad, M. K., & Lindberg, F. (2011). Understanding nature-based tourist experiences: An ontological analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *14*(6), 563-580. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2010.513730

Voigt, C., Howat, G., & Brown, G. (2010). Hedonic and eudemonic experiences among wellness tourists: An exploratory enquiry. *Annals of Leisure Research*, *13*(3), 541-562. https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2010.9686862

Volo, S. (2010). Bloggers' reported tourist experiences: Their utility as a tourism data source and their effect on prospective tourists. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *16*(4), 297-311. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766710380884

Walls, A. R., Okumus, F., Wang, Y. R., & Kwun, D. J. W. (2011). An epistemological view of consumer experiences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *30*(1), 10-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.03.008

Wong, I. A., In Veronica Fong, H., & Tingchi Liu, M. (2012). Understanding perceived casino service difference among casino players. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *24*(5), 753-773. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596111211237282

Yeoman, I., Robertson, M., Ali-Knight, J., Drummond, S., & McMahon-Beattie, U. (2012). *Festival and events management*. Oxon, New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080477701

Kako kakovost festivalske izkušnje vpliva na zadovoljstvo obiskovalca? Kvantitativni pristop

Izvleček

Namen raziskave, predstavljene v tem članku, je določiti, kako izbrane značilnosti mestnega dogodka učinkujejo na zadovoljstvo obiskovalcev. Še posebej je cilj ugotoviti dejavnike, ki so povezani z atmosfero dogodka, ki določa zadovoljstvo obiskovalca v mestni destinaciji kontinentalnega dela Hrvaške. V ta namen je bil na osnovi predhodnih raziskav Bitnerja (1992), Oliverja (1980, 1997), Bakerja in Cromptona (2000) ter Leeja in drugih (2008) oblikovan vprašalnik. Obsegal je mere za ocenjevanje atmosfere dogodka, zadovoljstva obiskovalca in demografskih značilnosti anketirancev. Raziskava je bila izvedena v letu 2018, in sicer med obiskovalci mestnega dogodka, ki poteka vsako leto v decembru. V enomesečnem obdobju smo pridobili skupno 191 vprašalnikov. Za določitev strukture dejavnikov atmosfere mestnega dogodka je bila uporabljena analiza glavnih komponent. Poleg tega je bila za določitev vrste dejavnikov, ki lahko služijo kot napovedovalci zadovoljstva uporabnika v kontekstu mestnega dogodka, uporabljena multipla regresijska analiza. Kot rezultat je analiza razkrila štiri dejavnike, ki so povezani z atmosfero mestnega dogodka. Poleg tega ti dejavniki pozitivno in znatno vplivajo na zadovoljstvo obiskovalca, kar nakazuje, da imajo pomembno vlogo v določanju zadovoljstva uporabnika v kontekstu mestnega dogodka. Te ugotovitve lahko prispevajo k izboljšanju znanja o mestnih dogodkih, njihovem vplivu na zadovoljstvo turista in posledično k boljšemu razumevanju specifičnih skupin obiskovalcev kot tudi k vzpostavljanju učinkovitih marketinških in promocijskih strategij.

Ključne besede: izkušnja, izkušnja dogodka, zadovoljstvo obiskovalca, multivariatna statistična analiza, turizem dogodkov