

A Comparative Study of Motivation across Different Festival Products

Eunju Woo
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Pamplin College of Business
Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management
Email: eunjuw3@vt.edu

Medet Yolal, PhD. Assistant Professor
Anadolu University
School of Tourism and Hotel Management
Yunusemre Campus, 26470, Eskisehir, Turkey.
E-mail: myolal@anadolu.edu.tr

Fatmagul Cetinel, PhD. Assistant Professor
Anadolu University
School of Tourism and Hotel Management
Yunusemre Campus, 26470, Eskisehir, Turkey.
E-mail: fatay@anadolu.edu.tr

Muzaffer Uysal, PhD. Professor
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Pamplin College of Business
Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management
Email: samil@vt.edu

Festivals and special events have increased worldwide because they provide significant economic, socio-cultural, and political impacts on their destination. While, a plethora of studies have examined tourists' motivation and socio-economic impacts, little research has been conducted on the motivation and socio-economic impact of festival attendees with regard to different product offerings. The first objective of this paper, therefore, is to investigate the underlying dimensions of motivation for attending an international festival in Turkey and whether motivation will vary across six different festival products (Symphony, Rock, World Music, Dance, Ballet, and Theater). The second purpose is to understand how festival attendees perceive the socio-economic impacts of the festival and how these perceived impacts vary across different festival attendee groups. Finally, the study examines the overall satisfaction of festival attendees with respect to different festival products.

The results show that there were significant differences in motivation among attendees from six different festival products. Duncan's multiple-range tests were performed to further examine differences in motivation among these attendees. The mean scores of different groups indicate that 'Rock Event' attendees tended to have lower motivation scores than other groups and have the lowest ratings on the factor of 'family togetherness'. However, attendees did not differ on the perceived importance of socio-economic impacts and satisfaction of the festival irrespective of the festival product attended.

KEY WORDS: Motivation, Perceived socio-economic impacts, Factor analysis, Multivariate Analysis of Variance

INTRODUCTION

Festivals and special events have increased in number and size, with various purposes including enhancing domestic culture and history, providing domestic recreation opportunities and contributing to the domestic economy by stimulating domestic tourism businesses (Getz, 2008; Long & Perdue, 1990). Getz (1991, 1997) considers festivals and special events as a new wave of alternative tourism that not only provides both tangible and intangible “profitable activities” in the community but also contribute to sustainable development. There is a multitude of studies that have examined different aspects of festivals and events.

Motivation is one of the important salient aspects of event motivation and has received significant attention since the early 1990s. A motive is an internal factor that arouses, directs, and integrates a person’s behavior (Iso-Ahola, 1980, p230). Fodness (1994) mentioned that motive is the driving force behind all behavior. Crompton & McKay (1997) also indicated that motives are the starting points that launch decision processes. Tourist’s motives are multiple and an individual may have several needs which he/she wants to satisfy (Pearce, 1982). Therefore, without identifying and understanding what motivates people to travel, effective marketing is impossible (Fodness, 1994). Uysal and Hagan (1993) also recognized that understanding tourists’ motivation allows researchers and marketers to better define the value of tourism behavior and future travel patterns.

In terms of festival attendees’ motives, Crompton & McKay (1997) mentioned three reasons for efforts yielding better understanding of the motives of festival visitors. First, motive is a key to designing and offering products for visitors. Different visitors have various needs and wants. Therefore, identification of their needs is a prerequisite for effectively developing elements of festivals. Secondly, motivation is an antecedent of satisfaction and satisfaction is a precursor to repeat visits. Most festivals and events are highly dependent upon repeat visitors. If needs are fulfilled, satisfaction and return visits will result. Therefore, there should be an acknowledgement of the needs which visitors are seeking to satisfy. Finally, identifying and prioritizing motives is a key ingredient in understanding a visitor’s decision process. Thus, it is likely to facilitate effectiveness in marketing endeavors and activities.

Although a significant number of studies have examined festival and event motivation, little research has been conducted on the motivation of festival attendees in relation to different product offerings. Therefore, this study attempts to make comparisons of event motivation between different event attendees (Symphony, Rock, World Music, Dance, Ballet, and Theater). Specifically, this study is designed to (1) identify major driving factors that attract visitors to the international festival; (2) examine whether any motivational differences exist across different festival product offerings; and (3) explore whether any socio-economic perception differences exist among attendee groups visiting different festival products and (4) investigate whether satisfaction differences exist among difference attendee groups.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Motivation

To explain tourists' motivation, three alternative frameworks have been commonly used to study and understand individual motives (Crompton & McKay, 1997). The three alternate frameworks are, Iso-Ahola's escaping-seeking dichotomy (1982; Snepenger et al 2006), the Travel Career Ladder (Pearce 2005; Pearce & Lee 2005), which is based upon Maslow's hierarchy of needs and the conceptualization of psychological maturation towards a self-actualization goal (Ryan, 1998), and the notion of pull-push factors (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977, 1981; Uysal, Li & Sirakaya-Turk, 2008). All three of these frameworks are imbedded in Maslow's motivation theory and are not necessarily mutually exclusive. According to Dann (2010), only the formulation of push-pull tourist motivation seems to have survived the full rigor of empirical verification.

A significant number of studies focused on festival attendees' motivation since Ralston and Crompton's first event motivation study in 1988. Uysal, Gahan & Martin (1993) examined empirically the theoretical framework of event motivation dimensions and assessed the stability and variability of these motives across different groups of individuals based on Travelers Rest's County Corn Festival, SC in 1991. This study developed 24 motivation items which resulted in five motivation dimensions: 'escape', 'excitement/thrills', 'event novelty', 'socialization', and 'family togetherness'. Since Uysal et al., other studies have also examined festival and event motivation using a similar scale. Backman et al (1995) examined traveler's motivation, demographic characteristics, and activities of those who had gone to festivals, special events or exhibitions based on data from the 1985 pleasure travel survey. Twelve motive items for travelers participating in festival were factor analyzed, resulting in five dimensions of motivation: 'excitement', 'external', 'family', 'socializing', and 'relaxation'. Differences in motivational factors according to demographic variables were tested, and among them several variables were statistically different. For instance, as festival travelers age, they are less likely to be motivated to travel for excitement. Single people are more motivated to attend festivals for excitement than married people; however, married people are more likely to attend festivals for family motives.

Schneider & Backman (1996) also investigated equivalence of a motivation scale based on Uysal et al (1993) work which is commonly employed among festival researchers. Specifically, they examined the factor structure of the scale to determine the underlying dimensions of festival motivation. The 23 motivation items were factor analyzed and resulted in five factor groupings: 'family togetherness', 'socialization', 'festival atmosphere', 'escape', and 'event novelty/excitement'. Although the order or importance of motivation factors differed from previous research, the results are similar to results from motivational research conducted in North America. Therefore, the results concurred that the scale has a high degree of transferability and applicability regardless of cultural boundaries.

Lee (2000) also investigated comparisons of event motivation between Caucasian and Asian visitor markets in the Asian setting of the Kyongju World Cultural Expo in Korea. The results showed that significant differences in motivation existed between Korean and Japanese and other two groups (American and Europeans). The mean values of motivation indicate that Western tourists were more strongly motivated to attend the Kyongju World Culture Expose than were the oriental tourists.

Chang (2006) profiled tourists based upon their motivation and demographic characteristics using Crompton & McKay (1997) 28 items scales. The author found five factors; 'equilibrium recovery', 'festival participation and learning', 'novelty-seeking', 'socialization', and 'cultural exploration'. Among five factors, cultural exploration is the most important factor attracting tourists to the aboriginal cultural festival. Moreover, motivational variables are found to be more important than demographic variables to explain segmentation.

Park et al (2008) investigated what major factors attracted tourists to attend the South Beach Wine and Food festival in Miami Beach, Florida. Forty-four motivational items were factor analyzed which resulted in seven motivation dimensions: 'taste new wine and food', 'enjoy the event', 'enhance social status', 'escape from routine life', 'meet new people', 'spend time with family', and 'meeting the celebrity and wine experts'. Moreover, difference in motivation across the five national groups was tested and the difference was found in the area of family influence.

Uysal & Li (2008) reviewed existing empirical research of festival and event motivation. They classified the most frequently mentioned dimensions of festival motivations: socialization (24%), followed by family togetherness (19.8%), novelty (19.0%), and escape (15.7%). The other major dimensions were cultural exploration (5%), entertainment (5.8%), and excitement (6.6%). General findings throughout literature review indicate that dimensions of motivation are similar in all the festival research; however, the specific components of factors may vary depending on types of festivals and events, therefore visitors cannot be treated as homogenous groups. However, most of the previous studies have been conducted based on one festival product offering even though depending on offerings of products, festival attendees' motivations may be different. Therefore, one of the main objectives of this study is to examine motivation across different festival product offerings.

Socio-Economic Impacts of Festivals and Events

Festivals and events have both advantages and disadvantages for the host destination and the community. Therefore, many previous studies have focused on the impacts of festivals and special events (Uysal & Gitelson, 1994). Mathieson & Wall (1982) found that perceived impacts of tourism can be divided into three traditional categories of economic, physical, and social but they mentioned that these were frequently overlapped and have both positive and negative sides. Smith (2005) mentioned that festivals and events generate revenues for the cities. Moreover, they create infrastructure improvement such as new facilities and venues. For instance, arts festivals in Australia and New Zealand have become multimillion-dollar business (Arcodia & Whitford, 2006). Similarly, the Woodford Folk Festivals on the Sunshine Coast of Queensland injected \$3 million into local economy (Kither, 1998). Chwe (1998) investigated that festivals and special events provide incentives for the local community thus festivals and special events are likely to serve to build social cohesion and trust. Yolal, Cetinel & Uysal (2009) also confirmed that building social cohesion in the community is one of the great advantages of festivals and events and mentioned that festivals and events also help to build an image in the minds of tourists.

Even though economic impact studies have tended to emphasize the benefits that accrue to destinations, festivals and events also create negative social, cultural, and environmental impacts through crowding, crime, community displacement, and commodification of culture (Presbury & Edwards, 2005). Barker, Page, & Meyer (2002) examined the impact of special

events on destination crime rates and concluded that potential impact of crime at special events is unquestionably based on changes in the status of population and criminal opportunities that a seasonal increase in tourism activity presents. Jurowski, Uysal & Williams (1997) investigated the community's attitude toward tourism. Their findings showed that residents perceived economic impacts significantly positive but the environmental impacts as a negative social cost. These kinds of negative impacts create tourist and community dissatisfaction.

Although a number of studies on motivation and perceived socio-economic impacts for festivals and events have been conducted on the same festival products, little research has focused on the perspective of socio-economic impacts across multiple festival products as part of the same event. Furthermore, different festival attendees may consume different festival and event products within the same event setting. Therefore, the second objective of this study is to examine the extent to which the perceived importance of socio-economic impacts and satisfaction may vary depending on the type of festival product offerings that attendees may visit and consume.

METHODOLOGY

Study Site

Eskisehir International Festival was held in Eskisehir, Turkey, in the central Anatolia. The city of Eskisehir is a college town and has cultural activities. The festival is one of the largest international arts festivals in Turkey. The festival, first organized in 1995 by the Zeytinoglu Foundation, attracts a significant number of visitors to its approximately 30 events over a period of nine days in mid-autumn every year. The purpose of the festival is to exhilarate and enrich cultural as well as business life in Eskisehir. The festival largely consisted of classical, jazz, blues, rock and world music, theater, ballet, and dance on seven major stages.

The questionnaire instrument was developed in both Turkish and English and consisted of four parts. The first part had a motivation scale, the second part had a scale of perceived socio-economic benefits of festivals, the third part had overall satisfaction scales and the last part consisted of demographic information. The self-administrated intercept survey was conducted by two well trained research assistants. The survey was administrated on November 10-14, 2009. The questionnaires were randomly handed out at the entrances of the event venues to the potential respondents and were immediately collected upon their completion before the event had started. A total of 523 usable questionnaires were collected during the event. Eighty-four questionnaires were obtained from symphony event visitors, 104 questionnaires from rock, 109 world music, 46 dance, 76 ballet, and 104 theater.

Measurement of Motivation, Socio-economic Impacts and Satisfaction

A set of 18 motivation items was initially generated from a review of festival research. This study adopted the motivation scale from Uysal and colleagues (1993), the benefits scales from Kim & Uysal (2003), and satisfaction items based on commonly accepted items. The last section of the questionnaire included such demographic variables as age, gender, marital status, education level, occupation, and monthly income in USD (Turkish Lira converted to USD).

In the motivation section of the survey questionnaire, 18 items were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale: 1-very important, 2-important, 3-undecided, 4- not important, and 5-not at all important. Respondents were asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagreed with each item on the scale. In the socio-economic impact section of questionnaire, 17 items were measured and three satisfaction items were also asked of respondents.

RESULTS

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The descriptive analysis of the demographic characteristics of attendees is summarized in Table 1. The gender distribution was quite uneven. Most of respondents were female (62.3%). Male respondents totaled 37.7%. More than 68% are single, had at least some college education (82.6%), and relatively young (under 30 years of age: 62%). Slightly over 40% of respondents are students and the remaining 60% represented the categories of educators (19.0%), engineer-technicians (9.9%), health professionals (6.8%), workers/ office workers (6.2%), retirees (4.7%), business managers or owners (3.7%), artists (1.2%), and others (8.3%). Slightly over 70% reported monthly income of more than \$600. Almost 30% reported monthly income of less than US\$600.

Table 1 Demographic information ($n=523$)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	197	37.7
Female	326	62.3
<i>Age</i>		
Less than 23 years old	176	33.7
23-30 years	148	28.3
31 years and older	199	38.0
<i>Marital status</i>		
Single	358	68.5
Married	165	31.5
<i>Education</i>		
Less than college (including two years)	91	17.4
College education	311	59.5
Post-graduate (MS and doctoral degree)	121	23.1
<i>Occupation</i>		
Student	208	40.3
Worker/official	32	6.2
Education(academician-teacher)	98	19.0
Engineer-technician	51	9.9
Artist	6	1.2
Health (Doctor-nurse-pharmacist)	35	6.8
Retired	24	4.7
Business manager or owner	19	3.7
Other	43	8.3
<i>Income</i>		
US \$100 to US\$600	97	29.6

US \$601 to US\$1,000	102	31.1
US 1,001 and higher	129	39.3

Factor Analysis of the Festival Motivation and Socio-economic Impacts

The 18 festival motivation items yielded five factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (Table 2). These factors explained 64% of the variance and were labeled: ‘socialization’, ‘excitement’, ‘event novelty’, ‘escape’, and ‘family togetherness’. All 18 items had factor loadings of over .44. The reliability alphas, which are designed to check internal consistency of items within each dimension, were greater than .72. These coefficients were higher than or close to the standard of .7 recommended by Nunnally (1978). Unlike the previous study by Yolal, Cetinel and Uysal (2009), this study resulted in five factors rather than four factors. However these findings still show consistencies and similarities with previous findings.

Table 2 Factor analysis of festival motivation

Motivation Item	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	Reliability coefficient
<i>Socialization</i>				
To be with people who enjoy the same things I do	.825	5.458	30.320	.83
For a chance to be with people who are enjoying themselves	.815			
To observe the other people attending the festival	.764			
To be with people of similar interest	.722			
Because I enjoy the festival crowds	.589			
So I could be with my friends	.442			
<i>Excitement</i>				
Because I was curious	.787	2.197	12.208	.768
To experience new and different things	.782			
Because it is stimulating and exciting	.629			
To experience the festival myself	.558			
<i>Event novelty</i>				
Because I enjoy special events	.813	1.548	8.598	.735
Because I like the variety of things to see and do	.745			
Because festivals are unique	.728			
<i>Escape</i>				
To have a change from my daily routine	.849	1.304	7.244	.728
For a change of pace from my everyday life	.804			
To get away from the demands of life	.697			
<i>Family togetherness</i>				
So the family could do something together	.864	1.077	5.981	.797
Because I thought the entire family would enjoy it	.840			
<i>Total variance explained</i>			64.351	

A similar principal component factor analysis for the 17 socio-economic impact items resulted in three factors which had eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (Table 3). The factors accounted for about 56% of the variance and were termed ‘community cohesion and social benefits’, ‘economic benefits’, and ‘social cost’. Factor loadings for the 17 items ranged from .493 to .860. The reliability alphas for the three dimensions were greater than .70.

Table 3 Factor analysis of socioeconomic impact

Impact Item	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	Reliability coefficient
<i>Community cohesion and social benefits</i>				
Increase employment opportunities	.794	6.136	36.093	.843
Help create cohesion in the community	.744			
Increase opportunities for shopping	.709			
Help foster the relationship between residents and visitors	.663			
Help preserve the local culture	.626			
Encourage locals to develop new facilities	.570			
Offer family-based recreation activities	.553			
<i>Economic benefits</i>				
Enhance community image to outsiders	.835	2.050	12.061	.825
Educational-make people aware	.707			
Help development of cultural life in the city	.652			
Provide more recreational opportunities	.625			
Build community pride	.578			
Generate revenues for civic projects	.564			
Increase standard of living	.493			
<i>Social cost</i>				
Put pressure on local services such as police and fire protection, utilities, roads	.860	1.333	7.844	.731
Increase traffic congestion	.842			
Increase the crime rate	.663			
<i>Total variance explained</i>			55.998	

Comparison of Motivation for Different Festival Products

The difference of motivation for the six different festival products was first examined using a MANOVA procedure. In this analysis, the five motivation factors were dependent variables and different festival products were used as the independent variable. The results indicated that different festival products had a significant effect on festival motivation ($p < .001$). Based on this result, a follow-up analysis of range tests was conducted. Significant differences were observed for the different festival products on four motivations at the .05 probability level (Excitement, Festival novelty, Escape, and Family togetherness).

On the motivation of 'excitement', the world music group showed the highest mean score; however, compared to other groups the rock group has the lowest score (Table 4). The 'event novelty' motivation factor appeared to be a strong motive for all groups of attendees. Dance group has the highest mean score. The 'escape' motive appeared to be a strong motive for all groups except the rock group. Compared to other groups, the rock group attendees did not perceive 'family togetherness' to be an important motive pushing them to attend the festival. For this group, the factor of 'event novelty' had the highest mean score.

Table 4 MANOVA results (Six different products and 4 motivation factors)

	Symphony (n=84)	Rock (n=104)	World music (n=109)	Dance (n=46)	Ballet (n=76)	Theater (n=104)	F-value	P-value
Socialization	3.440	3.292	3.440	3.620	3.373	3.348	.991	.422
Excitement	4.244 ^b	3.913 ^a	4.337 ^b	4.255	4.145	4.094	4.791	.000
Event Novelty	4.425	4.234 ^a	4.569 ^b	4.623 ^b	4.417	4.462 ^b	4.870	.000
Escape	4.222	3.981 ^a	4.315 ^b	4.362 ^b	4.197	4.208	3.028	.011
Family Togetherness	3.726 ^b	2.827 ^a	3.390 ^b	3.609 ^b	3.572 ^b	3.519 ^b	7.426	.000

Note: Superscripts with different letters are statistically significant from each other (Duncan procedure was used for multiple comparisons)

An examination of the festival motivation across the six different groups indicated that the rock group motivation differed from other groups' motivation. Compared to other groups, the members of the rock group had low mean scores on the factor of 'family togetherness'. This may be attributed to the composition of the rock groups' demographic characteristics (Table 5). This group was comprised of 52% female, 52% attendees are less than 23 years old, and 89% are single.

Table 5 Demographic information based on event products

		Symphony	Rock	World	Dance	Ballet	Theater
Gender	Female (%)	54	52	67	72	53	65
	Male (%)	46	48	33	28	23	35
Age	Less than 23 (%)	31	52	37	30	26	21
	23-30 (%)	27	26	32	46	17	28
	32 years and older (%)	42	22	31	24	57	51
Marital status	Single	57	89	73	76	54	60
	Married	43	11	27	24	46	40
Education	Less than college	26	12	14	13	20	20
	College education	54	67	67	74	51	48
	Post graduate	20	21	19	13	29	32
Incomes	US 100 to 600	13	12	18	41	13	13
	US 601-1000	20	67	17	20	22	33
	US1001 and higher	22	21	27	17	30	31

Comparison of Socio-economic Impacts for Different Festival Products

The difference of socio-economic impacts for the six different festival products were first examined using a MANOVA procedure. In this analysis, the three socio-economic impact factors were dependent variables and different festival products were used as the independent variable. The results indicated that different festival products had no significant effect on the perception of socio-economic impact factors ($p>.05$). In other words, the six groups did not differ on the positive impact domain nor on the negative impact (Table 6). Six groups indicated that both the community cohesion and social benefits aspects of festivals were more important to them than the perceived social cost of such events.

Table 6 MANOVA results (Six different products and 3 socioeconomic impacts)

	Symphony (n=84)	Rock (n=104)	World music (n=109)	Dance (n=46)	Ballet (n=76)	Theater (n=104)	F-value	P-value
Community cohesion and social benefits	4.128	3.933	4.008	4.009	4.060	4.158	1.527	.180
Economic benefits	4.493	4.434	4.456	4.562	4.468	4.549	.846	.518
Social cost	1.901	2.176	2.089	2.254	1.982	2.032	1.421	.215

Comparison of Satisfaction for Different Festival Products

ANOVA analysis was conducted to compare satisfaction with different festival products. Six groups did not differ, suggesting in this case that festival specific products do not play a role in satisfaction. The satisfaction mean scores ranged from 3.9 to 4.1. This means that most festival attendees were satisfied with their experiences regardless the type of festival product they attended and consumed.

CONCLUSION

The purposes of this study were to investigate the underlying dimensions of motivation and perceived socio economic impacts of festivals across six different festival products and to examine overall satisfaction of six different types of festival attendees. Factor analysis of 18 motivation items resulted in five factors: 'socialization', 'excitement', 'event novelty', 'escape', 'family togetherness'. Factor analysis of 17 socio-economic impact items resulted in three factors: 'community cohesion and social benefits', 'economic benefits', and 'social cost'.

The study revealed that significant differences in motivation existed among festival attendees with respect to the different types of festival products. However there is no significant difference between the perceived socio-economic impact of the festival and satisfaction with the festival. In other words, regardless of the festival product attended, attendees did not differ on the perceived importance of socio-economic impact factors and satisfaction in general. Attendees at least in this particular study of International Festival in Eskisehir converge on the perceived importance of impacts of festivals. Festivals and events do have both positive and negative socio-economic impacts in communities where they are held. In addition, festivals and events do help create cohesion and provide social benefits.

This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge about event motivation. The study revealed that that even in the same festival or event, attendees may be motivated by different offerings of festivals and events. Festivals that offer a variety of products should consider appealing to diverse groups of festival and event markets. Their marketing and promotion efforts should also be consistent with different product offerings and their associated target markets. As festivals and events become larger and try to broaden their market base, they will need information and studies such as this one in order to have solid information to develop effective and appropriate marketing and management strategies.

REFERENCE

- Arcodia, C., & Whitford, M. (2006). Festival attendance and the development of social capital. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 8(2), 1–18.
- Backman, K. F., Backman, S. J., Uysal, M., & Sunshine, K. M. (1995). Event tourism: an examination of motivations and activities. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(1), 15-24.
- Barker, M., Page, S. J., & Meyer, D. (2002). Modeling tourism crime-the 2000 America's cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 762–782.
- Chang, J. (2006). Segmenting tourists to aboriginal cultural festivals: An example in the Rukai tribal area, Taiwan. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1224-1264.
- Chwe, M. S. Y. (1998). Culture, circles and commercials: Publicity, common knowledge and social coordination. *Rationality and Society*, 10, 47–75.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408–424.
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425–439.
- Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, Ego-Enhancement and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 4, 184-194.
- _____ (1981). Tourism motivations: Appraisals. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 189–219.
- _____ (2010). Tourist Motivation and Quality of Life: In Search of the Missing Link. Unpublished paper.
- Fodness, D. (1994). Measuring tourism motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 555-581.
- Getz, D. (1991). *Festivals, special events, and tourism*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- _____ (1997). *Event Management & Event Tourism*. New York: Cognizant Communication Crop.
- Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, 29:403-428.
- Iso-Ahola, E. (1982). Towards a social psychology theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(2), 256–262.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Tourism Research*, 36(2), 3–11.
- Kither, L. (1998). It's party time for festival. *Sunshine Coast Daily*, December 27, p. 2.
- Lee, C. K. (2000). A comparative study of Caucasian and Asian visitors to a cultural expo in an Asian setting. *Tourism Management*, 21(2), 169–176.
- Long, P. T., & Perdue, R. R. (1990). The economic impact of rural festivals and special events: assessing the special distribution of expenditures. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(4), 10-14.
- Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts* Longman, Harlow.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Park, K. S., Reisinger, Y., & Kang, H. J. (2008). Visitors' motivation for attending the South Beach Wine and Food Festival, Miami Beach, Florida. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 25(2), 161–181.
- Pearce, P. L. (1982). *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behavior*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Uysal, M., L. Gahan and B. Martin.
- _____ (2005). Tourism behavior: Themes and conceptual schemes. Channel view,

Clevedon, UK.

- Pearce, P. L., & Lee, U. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 226-237.
- Presbury, R., & Edwards, D. (2005). Incorporating sustainability in meetings and event management education. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 1(1), 30–45.
- Ryan, C. (1998). The travel career ladder: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(4), 936–957.
- Schneider, I. E., & Backman, S. J. (1996). Cross-cultural equivalence of festival motivations: A study in Jordan. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 4(3/4), 139–144.
- Smith, M. F. (2005). Spotlight events, media relations, and place promotion: A case study. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 12(1–2), 115–134.
- Snepenger, D., J. King, E. Marshall, & M. Uysal. (2006). Modeling Iso-Ahola's Motivation Theory in the Tourism Context. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(2): 140-149.
- Uysal, M., Gahan, L. W., & Martin, B. (1993). An examination of event motivations: A case study. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 1(1), 5–10.
- Uysal, M., & Hagan, L. A. (1993). Motivations of Pleasure Travel and Tourism. In M. Khan, M. Olsen & T. Car (Eds.), *VNR's Encyclopedia of Hospitality and Tourism* (pp. 798-810). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Uysal, M., & R. Gitelson. (1994). Assessment of Economic Impacts: Festivals and Special Events. *Journal of Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 2 (1):3-10.
- Uysal, M., & Li, X. (2008). Trends and critical issues in festival & event motivation. In A. Aktas, M. Kesgin, E. Cengiz, & E. Yenidip (eds.). *International Cultural & Event Tourism: Issues and Debates*, 10–20. Ankara, Turkey: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Uysal, M., Li, X., & Sirakaya-Turk, E. (2008). Push-pull dynamics in travel decisions. In H. Oh (ed.). *Handbook of Hospitality Marketing Management*, 413–439. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Yolal, M., Cetinel, F., & Uysal, M. (2009). An examination of festival motivation and perceived relationship: Eskisehir international festival, *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, 10 (4), 276-291.

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank Ms. Zeynep Zeytinoglu, President of Zeytinoglu Foundation, for her valuable support in the process of data collection