

An Examination of Spring Festival Attendees' Motivations within Campus Recreation

Müge Akyıldız Munusturalar¹, Metin Argan² and Mehpare Tokay Argan³

Anadolu University, Sport Sciences Faculty, Recreation Department, Eskisehir, Turkey, 26470

E-mail: ¹<mugeakyildiz@anadolu.edu.tr>, ²<margan@anadolu.edu.tr>

Bilecik Seyh Edebali University, Bilecik, Turkey, 11210

E-mail: ³<mehpare.argan@bilecik.edu.tr>

KEYWORDS Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Festival Motivations. Recreational Spring Festival. Satisfaction. University Campus

ABSTRACT Special festivals at university campuses have increased in number and size with various purposes including enhancing organizational culture and providing campus recreation opportunities. It was aimed to identify the underlying dimensions of the Spring Festival motivation. The data was collected by means of a questionnaire consisted of three sections. The first section was comprised of 18 statements related to motives of Spring Festival attendees. The second section of the questionnaire includes 6 items about festival satisfaction as a dependent variable. The third section was related with festival participant behavior and demographic characteristics of the respondents. The sample comprised of university students who attended "Spring Fest 2011" at a Turkish state university in province of Eskisehir. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses revealed four factors labeled as entertainment, escape, novelty and socialization. According to the results it was found that there was a significant relationship between motivational factors and festival satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Festivals have seen rapid growth with regard to number, diversity, and popularity since the 1980s (Crompton and McKay 1997; Getz 1997; Yang et al. 2011). Many scholars (Long and Perdue 1990; Getz 1991, 2008) consider festivals as a new wave of alternative tourism which provide not only tangible and intangible profitable activities in the community but also contribute to sustainable development. It was defined as "one of the most exciting and fastest growing forms of leisure, business, and tourism-related phenomena" (Getz 1997: 1). Festivals demonstrate new entertainment forms which enable attendees to achieve their goals of cultural exploration, entertainment, novelty, and socialization (Crompton and McKay 1997; Huang et al. 2014).

Festivals are planned activities, related to a particular time and space, and each of them is unique due to the interaction among the setting, people, design and program (McDowall 2011).

Festivals are an essential part of the urban life, having generally many diversified themes such as thematic festivals, political events, cultural activities, music and art festivals, and sport events (Popescu and Corbos 2012). Additionally, they are special events with a strong cultural component that can play a significant role in the community life (Palma et al. 2013). Moreover, they are an essential part of the campus life at the universities. In recent years, festivals at the universities have become an interesting and significant student experience as a campus recreation activity. The number of university festivals in Turkey has increased significantly during the past two decades.

For example, Short Film Festival is a continuous annual event at Inonu University since 2008. The festival contest consists of three categories; fiction, documentary and experimental. During the festival, parallel activities such as panel discussions and workshops are also organized by the university. In addition, established 17 years ago, Anadolu University International Film Festival is an annual event that showcases international and Turkish films. In addition, Science Festivals were carried out by some universities such as Anadolu University, Mersin University, Hacettepe University and Gazi University. The festival at Anadolu University offers a wide range of activities related with science and

Address for correspondence:

Müge Akyıldız Munusturalar
Anadolu University
İki Eylül Campus
Faculty of Sport Sciences
Department of Recreation
Eskisehir, Turkey 26470
Telephone: +90 530 746 1141
E-mail: mugeakyildiz@anadolu.edu.tr

technology for 9 days. The last two days of this free event is open for the children of all ages. Jazz Festival at Anadolu University Campus is an annual event providing a valuable opportunity to experience live concerts for the students. Culture and Art Festival is held by Selcuk University occurring annually, and representing a full range of topics, including dance, theatre, film, arts, and education. Besides, Koç Fest is also an annual event organized by The Turkish University Sport Federation in cooperation with the universities in Turkey. It has been one of the biggest youth festival providing sports competitions and performances since 2006. Among the various types of festivals at universities, spring festivals are one of the most popular student attraction and they have become a fast growing social and cultural attraction at the university campuses. Spring Festival is widely celebrated by almost all the universities in Turkey and it means an organized series of activities such as concerts, opening and closing ceremonies, performances, and sporting activities staged by a university celebrating coming of the spring annually.

In the literature, since the 1960s many empirical and conceptual studies have examined festival attendee's motives (Getz 2008; McDowall 2011). Crompton and McKay (1997: 426) cited three reasons for efforts yielding better understanding of the festival motivation: "it is a key to designing offerings for festival attendees, second, it has a close relationship with satisfaction, and lastly it is crucial for understanding visitors' decision-making process. Thus, analysis of the motivations for attending festivals provides some useful insights for the marketers, organizers and researchers".

Objectives

Although a significant number of studies focus on festival motivation, attention has mainly been given to the mega-events and regional festivals have been neglected (Cheng et al. 2015). In addition, there is relatively little research on the motivational studies related specifically to spring festivals. Therefore, in addressing this limitation, the aim of this paper is to identify the aspects of spring festival motivation and its relationship with the festival satisfaction. Thus, this paper looks at an example of a spring festival - Spring Fest 2011- that held annually at a

state university in Eskisehir, Turkey. The festival was chosen as a novel case study, since the existing literature on festival motivation gives very little guidance on meeting attendees' need with a spring festival.

Literature Review

Festival Motivation

Prior studies have focused on different aspects of festivals such as economic and social impacts, residents' attitudes and perceptions, image and marketing, experiences and attendance motivation (Yang et al. 2011). Motivation has received significant attention since the early 1990s (Yolal et al. 2012). An extensive body of the literature indicates that motivations are considered to be critical to make a decision about participating behavior.

Motives can be considered as the driving forces behind all behaviors (Viviers et al. 2013). Iso-Ahola (1980: 230) defines the motive as "an internal factor that arouses, directs, and integrates a person's behavior" (cited in Yolal et al. 2012). In terms of festival, it was defined as "a driving force that arouses people's interest to attend a festival" (McDowall 2011: 273).

The literature related to festival motivation identified some common factors across different festivals including escape, family togetherness, and socialization (Williams and Saayman 2013). In leisure studies, motivations can be classified into six categories including physiological, social, psychological, emotional, intelligent, and spiritual aspects (McLean et al. 2005; Huang et al. 2014). Similarly, motivations of visitors of the festivals may be clustered into cultural exploration, novelty, socialization, interaction and gregariousness factors (Crompton and McKay 1997; Huang et al. 2014). Some researchers (Uysal et al. 1993; Backman et al. 1995; Schneider and Backman 1996) identified festival motivations as an aspect of escape, excitement, novelty, socialization, family togetherness and relaxation. Researchers have examined motivations for the different types of festival. For example, Yolal et al. (2009) investigated festival motivations for attending the International Festival in Eskisehir, Turkey. Eighteen motivation items were factor analyzed and four dimensions of motivation emerged: escape and excitement, family togetherness, event novelty, and socialization. In addi-

tion, McDowall (2011) summarized dimensions of motivation as socialization, event novelty, escape, excitement, family togetherness, nature appreciation, curiosity, novelty or regression, cultural exploration, recovery equilibrium, external interaction or socialization, gregariousness, being with friends, being entertained, and enjoying special events. Similarly, Duran and Hamarat (2014) explored visitor motivation for attending the International Troia Festival, and they identified six distinct factors: cultural exploration, family togetherness, socialization, novelty, escape and excitement, event attractions. Kitterlin and Yoo (2014) have also found festival scape factors such as program content, staff, facility, food, and benefits have a significant impact on attendees' motivation and loyalty behavior. Blesic et al. (2014) investigated Exit Music Festival attendees' motivation, and found that exploration of the festival program and atmosphere, perception of the festival and learning, and socialization were the main motivational dimensions. Matheson et al. (2014) studied visitor motivations for the Fire Festival and explored the role of spirituality on the festival motivation. Their findings showed that there was a significant correlation between motivational dimensions (cultural adventure and escape) and spiritual attitudes. A recent study by Yoo et al. (2015) divided motivations of the Food Festival into two categories, and as a result of qualitative study they identified six intrinsic motivations (social interaction, novelty, nature, family togetherness, cultural exploration and relaxation) and three extrinsic motivations (previous food festival experience, natural environment, and food). In research on the festival motivation, Cheng et al. (2015) have found that when attendees' novelty seeking in Fireworks Festival is stronger, their satisfaction in the event will be higher. Huang and Lee (2015) derived three motivation domains (learning new things, socialization and family togetherness) from their sample of multicultural festival visitors. They also identified motivations which are particular to a multicultural festival including reminiscing about previous cross-cultural experiences, nostalgia, celebrating own culture, and obligation. Reviewing the festival motivation researches from Table 1, people attend festivals for a variety of reasons.

The reason to report and summary of the available research in the context of the festival motivation is to evaluate the results critically.

Two important points emerged from the thorough search of the literature. First, literature review concludes that multiple factors are essential for the festival motivation and that they vary significantly from festival to festival. Some researchers have focused on whether differences occur in the motivations of attendees to different types of festivals. Varying motivations were identified for the festival types and significant differences in motivation were found between the festival attendees. Furthermore, authors suggested that people attend different types of festivals for different motivations and events should be viewed as a distinctive phenomenon that affects peoples' festival motivations (Chen 2011). It is therefore clear that festivals and special events cannot be seen as homogenous, as they vary depending on the visitor segment, type of festival, theme, venue, contents and purposes of the festival, hence motives differ from festival to festival (Nicholson and Pearce 2001; Park et al. 2008; Saayman 2011; Blesic et al. 2014). Similarly, Yolal et al. (2012) claimed that dimensions of the festival motivation could be similar, however, the specific components of dimensions may vary depending on the types of the festivals and motivations may change across different festival attendee groups. As such, common festival motivations may not be suitable for explaining motives of different types of festivals (Huang and Lee 2015). Second, the literature review for the festival motivation demonstrates that numerous studies have investigated motives of the festival goers (Pegg and Patterson 2010), however these studies neglect the motivations of spring festivals. These two points emerged from the literature review led researchers to study dimensions of motivation for the spring festival.

Relationship between Motivation and Satisfaction

Satisfaction has been defined as consumer's evaluative judgment related to the pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfillment (Oliver 1996). Giese and Cote (2000) indicate that satisfaction has been typically conceptualized as either an emotional or cognitive response. Prior empirical studies (Lee et al. 2004; Huang et al. 2014) have indicated that motivation is an important determinant for behavioral intentions and additionally motivation has a significant impact on festival satisfaction (Ross and Iso-Ahola 1991;

Table 1: Previous researches on festival motivations

<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Festival type and location</i>	<i>Motivations/Factors</i>	<i>Year</i>
Lee, Lee and Wicks	2000 Kyongju World Culture Expo, South Korea	Cultural exploration, family togetherness, novelty, escape, event attractions, socialization	2004
Bowen and Daniels	Fairfax Music Festival and Virginia-USA	Discovery, music, enjoyment	2005
Yuan, Cai, Morrison and Linton	Vintage Indiana Wine and Food Festival, USA	Festival and escape, wine, socialization, family togetherness	2005
Park, Reisinger and Kang	South Beach Wine and Food Festival, Florida-USA	Taste, enjoyment, social status, change, meeting people, family, meeting experts	2008
Pegg and Patterson	Tamworth Country Music Festival, Australia	Love country music, friends/family, desire to attend, business/professional reasons, country music awards, chance to meet stars, annual holiday, line dancing	2010
Bayrak	Efes Pilsen Blues Festival, Izmir-Turkey	Socialization, escape, festival	2011
Saayman	Cultivaria Art Festival, South Africa	Event attraction, cultural exploration, escape	2011
Chen	Lotus World Music and Art Festival, Indiana, USA	Family togetherness, community support, novelty, relaxation, socialization	2011
Kruger and Saayman	Roxette Concerts and Cape Town, Sun City	Artist affiliation and unique experience, socialization and event novelty, fun and group affiliation, enjoyment and entertainment, nostalgia	2012
Savinovic, Kim and Long	2009 Festa-Croatian Food and Wine Cultural Festival, Adelaide-South Australia	Community support, escape, knowledge/education, food, wine and entertainment, novelty, family togetherness, marketing, socialization	2012
Yolal, Woo, Cetinel and Uysal	Eskisehir International Festival, Turkey	Socialization, excitement, event novelty, escape, family togetherness, meeting people, family togetherness, past or prior experience	2012
Yu and Yen	2010 Lemonade Fair, Minnesota-USA	Novelty, exploration, family gathering, recovering equilibrium, socialization	2012
Dikmen and Bozda?lar	International Bellapais Music Festival, North Cyprus	Free tickets, desire to attend, reputation, explore new things,	2013
Lee and Hsu	Aboriginal Festivals, Taiwan	Cultural experiences, leisure and psychology, self-expression	2013
Blesic, Pivac, Stamenkovic and Besermenji	Dragacevo Trumpet Ethno Music Festival, Guca-Serbia	Festival perception and learning, exploration of festival program and atmosphere, psychophysical welfare, socialization	2013
Huang, Lee, Yeh and Hsiao	Coffee Festival, Taiwan	Curiosity/learning, escape, socialization/ family togetherness, pleasure/release	2014

Fielding et al. 1992; Lee et al. 2004; Huang et al. 2014). In recent studies, the relationship between festival motivation and attendees' satisfaction has received considerable attention. Many studies examined the factors which affect the levels of festival attendees' satisfaction and their loyalty towards the festivals (Wan and Chan 2013) and indicated that attributes leading higher satisfaction and loyalty were the festival program and the quality of facilities including sufficient facilities at the festival site, clean area and a nice atmosphere in the festival site (Ozdemir and Culha 2009). In addition studies evaluated motiva-

tion and its effects on satisfaction during different types of festivals such as hot air balloon festival (Mohr et al. 1993), island events (Nicholson and Pearce 2001), aboriginal festivals (Lee and Hsu 2013), Blues festivals (Bayrak 2011), Roxette concerts (Kruger and Saayman 2012), cultural festivals (Formica and Uysal 1998; Savinovic et al. 2012), arts and music festivals (Pegg and Peterson 2010; Saayman 2011; Yu and Yen 2012), and wine and food festivals (Yuan et al. 2005; Park et al. 2008). However, little is known about the motives of spring festivals attendees, and empirical results remain unclear regarding

whether the spring festival motivation can exert a significant and positive influence on satisfaction. Therefore, the popularity of the spring festivals at the universities and increasing amount of interest related with festival attendees' motivation and their satisfaction led to construct conceptual model for this paper and the following hypotheses was stated:

H1. The constructs of spring festival motivation relate positively to satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY

Measurement Instrument

As the aim of this paper was to identify the underlying dimensions of spring festival motivation, quantitative research design was adopted and the data was collected by means of a questionnaire as the main technique. The questionnaire was designed with three sections. The first section was comprised of 18 statements related to motives of spring festival attendees. The statements in the first section were adapted and modified from the past festival studies (Uysal et al. 1993; Crompton and McKay 1997; Lee 2000; Nicholson and Pearce 2001; Lee et al. 2004; Savinovic et al. 2012). Statements in the second section were concerned with the satisfaction as the dependent variable. Six single satisfaction statements were adapted from Moscardo and Pearce's (1999) study. In the first and second section, respondents were asked to indicate their attitudes on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "1=strongly disagree" to "5=strongly agree". The last section was designed to collect festival participant behavior and demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Data Collection and Sample

The sample comprised of visitor students who have participated in Spring Fest 2011. Spring Fest, which has more than 30 years of history, is the annual social and cultural festival held on a university campus of Eskisehir-Turkey, during the month of May in the spring semester. The visitors of Spring Fest 2011 are the population of students of the university. It is one of the largest student festivals in Eskisehir. During the festival, students from different departments of the university wear masks and costumes, walk the city streets throwing flowers and welcome com-

ing of the spring. It starts in the downtown area of the city with the opening ceremony pageant and continues at the campus with numerous sporting activities, concerts, dance shows and food and craft vendors.

A convenience sampling method was adapted in the present paper, because it was not physically possible to employ a random sampling method in such an open area. In convenience sampling, the researcher selects subjects from whoever is available at a given place at a given time (Blankenship 2010). To collect data festival-intercept survey technique was used by stationing research surveyor along different points of spring festival area. Self-administrated and research-aided questionnaires were distributed by surveyor. The time to explain the study and complete the questionnaire was approximately 15 minutes. Approximately, 500 visits were recorded during the festival, a total of 400 questionnaires were distributed, 250 of which were returned, resulting in a response rate of 62.5 percent, and representing about 50 percent of the population.

In determining the appropriate sample size for the current paper, Wimmer and Dominick (1997: 73) suggested that "one guideline recommended for multivariate studies is as follows: 50=very poor, 100=poor, 200=fair, 300=good, 500=very good". In addition, the appropriate sample size depends on several factors, different authors tend to give different guidelines concerning the number of cases required for Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Some researchers stated that SEM analyses should not be performed on sample sizes smaller than 200, whereas others suggested minimum sample sizes between 100 and 200 participants (Worthington and Whittaker 2006). According to Pallant (2011: 187), "ideally the overall sample size should be 150+ and there should be a ratio at least five participants per variable". Tabachnick and Fidell (2007: 123) give another formula for calculating sample size requirements: $N > 50 + 8m$ (m : number of independent variables). In a population of 500 (N), 217 respondents (n) would be seen as representative and result in a 95 percent level of confidence with a ± 5 percent sampling error (Sekaran 2002). Therefore, it can be suggested that there is an adequate sample size and ratio of cases to variables in this research.

RESULTS

Sample Profile

The demographic characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 2. The sample comprised of 250 student attendees of the Spring Fest 2011 of whom 56.8 percent were male and 43.2 percent were female. The respondents ranged in age from 18 years to 28 years. The largest age groups were between 23-24 age brackets, represented by 34.4 percent of the respondents. The distribution of the respondents by their current year of study are as follows: third rate class students constituted the largest student cohort by 30 percent, followed by the sophomores, senior year students, juniors and the last group was prep class by the rate of 1.2 percent.

The daily spending amount in festival showed a wide distribution; about 29.2 percent of the respondents did not spend any money during the festival, 44.4 percent spent less than 10\$, 16.8 percent spent \$11–\$15, and 9.6 percent spent more than \$16.

As shown in Table 3 majority of the respondents (90.4%) participate to festival with friends. In terms of frequency of the festival participation, 31.2 percent of the respondents have participated for the first time, and 25.6 percent have participated in the Spring Fest for three times. On the other hand, 42 percent of the respondents informed about Spring Fest by advice or word-of-mouth communication. In addition, 40.4 percent of the respondents spent at least 2-3 hours, and 29.6 percent of respondents spent 3-4 hours on festival arena.

Table 3: Participation behavior of the respondents

	Frequency	%
<i>Frequency of Participation</i>		
Once	78	31.2
Twice	62	24.8
Three times	64	25.6
Four times and >	46	18.4
<i>Event Awareness Style</i>		
Written and visual media	26	10.4
Internet	37	14.8
Brochures, advertisements, billboards	82	32.8
Advice or word-of-mouth	105	42.0
<i>Average Time Spending</i>		
2 hours and <	53	21.2
2-3 hours	101	40.4
3-4 hours	74	29.6
4 hours and >	22	8.8
<i>Event Participation Style</i>		
Alone	13	5.2
With friends	226	90.4
Other	11	4.4

Reliability and Validity

To verify the face scope validities, 5 Turkish experts having extensive studies and publications in leisure area, were asked to evaluate the questionnaire items. One of the most critical elements in generating the content validity of the items in a survey is conceptually defining the domain of the characteristics (Churchill 1995). Content validity of the research was established through the adoption of validated instruments by previous studies (Cowton 1998). For the construct validity of the questionnaire, EFA and CFA were applied. Construct validity is the extent to which the items on a scale measure the abstract or theoretical construct (Churchill 1979). For the festival motivation variables, Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) was 0.896, indicating that the sample was

Table 2: Characteristics of the respondents

	Frequency	%		Frequency	%
<i>Gender</i>			<i>Class</i>		
Male	142	56.8	Prep class	3	1.2
Female	108	43.2	Junior	64	18.4
<i>Age</i>			Sophomore	83	25.6
20 and <	46	18.4	Third rate class	75	30.0
21-22	80	32.0	Senior	62	24.8
23-24	86	34.4	<i>Average spending (\$)</i>		
25 and >	38	15.2	No spending	73	29.2
			10 USD and <	111	44.4
			11-15 USD	42	16.8
			16 USD and >	24	9.6
				3	1.2

adequate for the factor analysis (Kaiser 1974). The Bartlett Test for Sphericity (BTS) was 2432.282 ($p < .001$), indicating that the hypothesis variance and covariance matrix of variables as an identity matrix were rejected; therefore, factor analysis was appropriate. Bagozzi and Yi (1988) defined a factor loading exceeding 0.70 as evidence of convergent validity. As suggested by Meehl (1990) and Chin (1998) most of the loadings should be, in CFA models, 0.60 or above, indicating that each measure is accounting for a consistent portion of the variance of the underlying latent variable (Longo and Mura 2007). Child (1970) states that a factor loading value of 0.50 and above is considered good and very significant, whereas 0.45 is fair and 0.32 and below is poor. In the current paper, factor loadings were between .45 and .82, indicating good convergent validity (Kaiser 1974; Steenkamp and Trijp 1991). In measurement models, convergent validity occurs while each variable significantly loads to related latent variable. In the measurement model, all the t-values were higher than 1.96. Thus we assume that this can be considered as a support for convergent validity (Steenkamp and Trijp 1991). Discriminant validity occurs when one measure in a construct does not correlate with other measures in other constructs. It is recommended that constructs that do not have high

correlations provide discriminant validity (Byrne 2001). While correlations between factors were not higher than 0.70 (see Table 4), we can consider this as a support for discriminant validity. Another way to provide discriminant validity is to check for correlations among the factors of the proposed model.

Table 4: Correlation matrix and descriptive statistics

Constructs	1	2	3	4
Entertainment	1.00			
Escape	0.63*	1.00		
Novelty	0.67*	0.55*	1.00	
Socialization	0.59*	0.44*	0.54*	1.00
M	4.12	4.01	3.87	4.04
SD	0.69	0.78	0.76	0.71

* $p < 0.01$

Additionally, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was computed to assess the internal consistency reliability. As reported in Table 5, the Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was .92 and four dimensions had high reliability coefficients exceeded the 0.70 cut-off value as recommended by Nunnally (1978). Composite Reliabilities (CR) were higher than 0.70 indicated satisfactory level. Finally, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

Table 5: Festival attendees' motivations

Constructs	Std. loadings	CR	AVE	α
<i>Entertainment</i>				
I came to see the atmosphere of event	0.60	0.78	0.42	0.85
I came to see different events	0.63			
I came to have fun	0.73			
I came because I enjoy these events	0.68			
I came to see fun activities	0.60			
<i>Escape</i>				
I came to escape from routine life		0.86	0.60	0.86
I came to relieve boredom	0.82			
I came to change my routine life	0.82			
I came to relieve daily stress	0.66			
<i>Novelty</i>				
I came because I like a variety of things to see and do	0.45	0.78	0.43	0.81
I came to enjoy special events	0.65			
I came to experience different things	0.64			
I came to experience new things	0.76			
I came because I am curious	0.72			
<i>Socialization</i>				
I came to be with friends who enjoy the same thing	0.78	0.78	0.47	0.73
I came because the event is different activity	0.71			
I came to meet and to see different people.	0.52			
I came to be with my friends	0.70			

$\chi^2 = 204.49$ ($p = 0.000$), $df = 81$, $\chi^2/df = 2.51$, RMSEA = 0.078, SRMR = 0.052, GFI = .90, AGFI = .85, NFI = .96, NNFI = .97, CFI = .98, IFI = .98

values ranged from 0.42 to 0.60, and revealed three of the four dimensions failed to meet the recommended criteria.

Measurement Model of the Spring Festival Motivations

Principal factor analysis was used to sort out and classify variables as well as to convert them into main factors. According to results, the factors related with motives of spring festival were classified into four dimensions. These factors were named as entertainment, escape, novelty and socialization. Total explained variance in this scale was 65.385 percent. There are significant relationships ($p < 0.05$) between motivational factors and satisfaction.

After principal factor analysis, the motivation items were subjected to CFA. The finding of the CFA revealed the data fit the model reasonably well, although the chi-square goodness-of-fit index was statistically significant 204.49, $p < 0.01$. According to Kline (2005), good fitting models are reflected with a non-significant χ^2 value, a value less than 3.0 for the χ^2/df ratio. In the current paper, the ratio of the Chi-square to its degrees of freedom (χ^2/df) was calculated as 2.51, meeting the acceptance level 3.0 (Kline 2005). It is commonly accepted that chi-square statistic will reject valid models in large samples (Bagozzi and Yi 1988; Bove and Johnson 2006); therefore, the many researchers relied on the goodness-of-fit (GFI), the comparative fit index (CFI), the incremental fit index (IFI), the non-normed fit index (NNFI), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) (Meehl 1990; Chin 1998; Longo and Mura 2007). Table 5 presents the values of fit statistics. CFI and NNFI indicate how much better the hypothesized model fits compared to the base model. A value greater than 0.90 indicates an acceptable fit with the data (Hu and Bentler 1999). SRMR and RMSEA measure the pooriness of fit (Lee et al. 2007). Browne and Cudeck (1993) suggested that SRMR and RMSEA should be below the cut-off value 0.08. In the measurement model, the RMSEA value of 0.078 was well below 0.1 or 0.08, indicating a low discrepancy between the implied covariance in the model and observed covariance in the data (Li et al. 2006). In addition, SRMR value (0.052) was also well below the 0.08. Five of all four incremental fit indices (GFI = 0.90, AGFI = 0.85; CFI

= 0.98, NFI = 0.96, NNFI = 0.97, IFI = 0.98) met or exceeded the preferred level of 0.9 (Bagozzi and Yi 1988). Only AGFI was less than required level, and close to it at 0.85.

Measurement Model of the Satisfaction

Satisfaction as a dependent dimension contains six items. Factor loadings of the items were ranged between 0.53 and 0.70. Reliability and CR were higher than 0.70 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). As stated by Kline (2005), the χ^2 value indicated good fit data ($\chi^2=4.68$, $df=2$, $\chi^2/df=2.34$, $p=0.09618$). The RMSEA of .073 and SRMR of .023 were acceptable as less than .08. The comparative fit indices were all higher for the model, NFI=.99, NNFI=.98 and CFI=.99. Additionally, all of the goodness of fit indices (IFI=.99, GFI=.99, AGFI=.95) exceeded well the .90 acceptance level of model fit.

Table 4 displays the means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients. By running descriptive statistics, mean and standard deviation were found for the each factor. According to the descriptive statistics, the factor of entertainment had a higher mean score (4.12) compared to the remaining three constructs. The bivariate relationships revealed that all of the variables significantly correlated (0.44-0.67). All four factors were moderately correlated with one another. Construct-based scales were generated by summing the relevant items.

The Relationship between Spring Festival Motivations and Satisfaction

SEM was used to analyze the relationships between the dimensions of spring festival motivations and attendees' satisfaction (see Table 6).

Table 6: Results for the structural model

	Standardized solution	t-value
Socialization → Novelty	0.33	4.37
Escape → Novelty	0.55	6.89
Novelty → Entertainment	0.83	9.26
Entertainment → Satisfaction	0.67	8.36

$\chi^2 = 371.66$ ($p=0.000$), $df=144$, $\chi^2/df=2.58$, RMSEA = 0.080, SRMR = 0.079, GFI = .86, AGFI = .82, NFI = .95, NNFI = .96, CFI = .97, IFI = .97

The ratio of χ^2/df (2.58) was satisfactory indicating below the cut-off point 3.0 (Kline 2005).

The fit indices produced through the SEM indicated that the model provided adequate fit for the proposed. The SMSEA (0.079) was below the cut-off point 0.08, while NFI (.95), NNFI (.96), CFI (.97) and IFI (.97) indicated an adequate fit of data given that each met the recommended criteria of .90 (Kline 2005). All of the path diagrams in the model had higher t-values than 1.96, indicating that the model is significant at the .05 level. T-values equal to 1.96 or above are generally considered to have a strong causal relation among variables (Khine 2013). Taken as a whole, the goodness of fit statistics produced by the SEM indicated that overall data may fit the model satisfactory.

According to the results of SEM, the dimensions of socialization and escape had positive influence on novelty in spring festivals. In addition, novelty significantly affected entertainment dimension. And lastly, the model indicates that entertainment had a direct effect on event satisfaction.

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this paper was to investigate the motivational factors related to the spring festival and to analyze effects of these factors on satisfaction in the context of spring festivals in a Turkish state university in 2011. This descriptive research investigates the dimensions that underlie festival attendees' motivation and the relationship between these dimensions and festival satisfaction.

The results of EFA and CFA produced four important dimensions of spring festival motivation: entertainment, escape, novelty and socialization. The dimensions were found to be reliable and valid. This finding is similar to previous studies (Uysal et al. 1993; Backman et al. 1995; Schneider and Backman 1996; Crompton and McKay 1997; Yolal et al. 2009; McDowall 2011; Yolal et al. 2012; Williams and Saayman 2013; Huang et al. 2014; Duran and Hamarat 2014; Blesic et al. 2014; Yoo et al. 2015) suggested attributes socialization, event novelty, escape, excitement, family togetherness, nature appreciation, curiosity, novelty or regression, cultural exploration, recovery equilibrium, external interaction or socialization, gregariousness, being with friends, being entertained as festival motivation. In particular, entertainment and socialization were stronger motivational dimensions

with higher mean scores, which is consistent with the findings of some prior studies (Yolal et al. 2009; Yang et al. 2011; Yolal et al. 2012; Blesic et al. 2014) related with various festivals in different regions.

In addition, the results of SEM indicated that there were meaningful relationships among motivational factors and satisfaction. Socialization and escape were found to be related with the festival satisfaction through novelty. Similarly, novelty had a positive impact on entertainment, and entertainment was found to be directly related with the satisfaction. Therefore, it is important to note that socialization and escape act as a stimulus that improve novelty, and novelty enhances entertainment, and entertainment plays a significant role to enhance festival satisfaction. It is also interesting to report that socialization, escape and novelty aspects of motivation were not directly related with the satisfaction. Similarly, this well supported by Yolal et al. (2012) who identified socialization, excitement, event novelty, escape and family togetherness as motivational factors related with International Festival, and examined the effects of motivational factors on satisfaction. However, the study revealed no significant relationship between these factors and satisfaction. Thus, they suggested that attendees were satisfied with the festival regardless of the motivational dimension.

The findings from this paper also outlined that the dimension of entertainment played the most significant role in explaining the level of overall satisfaction. As suggested by Yang et al. (2011), entertainment activities are very important part of the festivals, which could attract many participants in a short time to enjoy the event and prolong the length of staying time.

Since this is the first attempt to examine the motivations and their influence on satisfaction in the context of a spring festival in a Turkish students sample, it is hard to find any evidence to contradict or provide additional comments. However, the results can be discussed in the context of motivations of different types of festivals in different geographical regions. For example, the tourists in the Yanshuei Fireworks Festival in Taiwan perceived novelty seeking as an important factor for satisfaction (Cheng et al. 2015). Also, participants of the International Troia Festival ranked family togetherness and cultural exploration as the most important motives (Duran and Hamarat 2014). Similarly, cultural explo-

ration was ranked as the most important motivational factor by the visitors of the Kyongju Cultural Expo in South Korea (27% of total variance explained) (Lee 2000), by the participants of the festival in San Antonio (23% of total variance explained) (Crompton and McKay 1997), and by the visitors of the aboriginal festivals in Taiwan (40% of total variance explained) (Lee and Hsu 2013). Respondents in the Exit Music Festival perceived socialization as the most important motivation (21% of total variance explained) (Blesic et al. 2014). Similarly, Yolal et al. (2009) found that participants of the Eskisehir International Festival ranked socialization as the most important motivational dimension (32% of total variance explained). However, Blesic et al. (2013) reported that respondents in the Ethno Music Festival ranked festival perception and learning (26% of total variance explained) higher than the socialization (14% of total variance explained). In the study of Kruger and Saayman (2012), artist affiliation and unique experience had the highest mean score among the other motivational dimensions for the Roxette Live Music Festival. Visitors in the Food and Wine Festival in South Australia perceived knowledge and education as the most significant antecedent of satisfaction ($\beta=.213, p<.05$) (Savinovic et al. 2012). These results showed that those attending different kinds of festival in different regions were significantly more likely to be motivated by cultural exploration and novelty, and significantly less motivated by entertainment. Participants who attended the Spring Festival were more strongly motivated by desires to entertain than by the other motives. According to these data, it can be concluded that those attending in the Spring Festival are more likely to entertain and socialize, rather than desiring cultural experience or novelty. In addition, these findings were consistent with the results of the previous researches (Nicholson and Pearce 2001; Park et al. 2008; Saayman 2011; Blesic et al. 2014) that suggested motives change across different types of festivals.

CONCLUSION

The findings from this paper offer both practical and theoretical implications and contributions to the organizers and researchers. A key theoretical contribution is the application of the reliable and valid scale to measure spring festival motivations. This led to generate two major

conclusions: Firstly, motivations of the student attendees of the Spring Fest 2011 were four domains: entertainment, escape, novelty and socialization, secondly entertainment was the most significant predictor of satisfaction. Knowing the extent of the relationship that exists between satisfaction and motivational dimension of entertainment may provide the festival organizers at the campuses to build new insights for the future organizations. Furthermore, it can be suggested that the results of this paper can contribute to design a new form of entertainment activities to stimulate more attendees to the spring festivals. Based on the findings regarding motivational dimensions, campus recreation managers of the spring festivals should pay much more attention to entertaining activities than other specific constructs including novelty, escape and socialization.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Future research on festival experience could be extended to include a wider demographic base, both geographically and internationally, to further explore the extent to which the findings are generalizable. Further research may apply our conceptual framework to major or hallmark events in different universities. This effort would provide a great helpful insight to clarify motivational factors of different festivals. Future research should investigate to obtain a better understanding of the attitudes, motives, satisfaction and participation frequencies of the festival attendees to help the campus recreation managers to improve festival programs. Furthermore, additional data including perception, event brand image, and perception festival quality could be gathered from participants. Finally, future research may use structural equation modeling to demonstrate the relationship among scales including festival experience, festival loyalty, and festival benefits. Despite these limitations, the results of current paper can be evaluated a sign of motivational factors toward spring festivals in the universities.

LIMITATIONS

Certain limitations should be kept in mind when interpreting the preliminary findings reported in this paper. The current paper focused specifically on a limited number of people. Although

the sample was appropriate for a study on festival motivation, the results may differ if probability sampling methods are used. Because non-probability samples are not representative of the population. Therefore, the results may not adequately represent the total population in Turkey. This paper was conducted during a four-day period of the 2011 Spring Fest, and the generalization of the findings of this paper was limited to those festival attendees. Consequently, that is why the results cannot be applied to all festival participants.

REFERENCES

- Backman KF, Backman SJ, Uysal M, Sunshine KM 1995. Event tourism: An examination of motivations and activities. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(1): 15-24.
- Bagozzi RP, Yi Y 1988. On the evaluation of structural equations models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1): 74-94.
- Bayrak GO 2011. Festival motivators and consequences: A case of Efes Pilsen Blues Festival, Turkey. *Anatolia- An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 22(3): 378-389.
- Blankenship DC 2010. *Applied Research and Evaluation Methods in Recreation*. United States: Human Kinetics.
- Blesic I, Pivac T, Stamenkovic I, Besermenji S 2013. Motives of visits to ethno music festivals with regard to gender and age structure of visitors. *Event Management*, 17: 145-154.
- Blesic I, Pivac T, Stamenkovic I, Besermenji S, Markovic S 2014. Investigation of visitor motivation of the Exit Music Festival (The Republic of Serbia). *Journal of Tourism, Studies and Research in Tourism*, 18: 8-15.
- Bove LL, Johnson LW 2006. Customer Loyalty to one service worker: Should it be discouraged. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23: 79-91.
- Bowen HE, Daniels MJ 2005. Does the music matter? Motivations for attending a music festival. *Event Management*, 9(3): 155-164.
- Browne MW, Cudeck R 1993. Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In: KA Bollen, JS Long (Eds.): *Testing Structural Equation Models*. Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 136-162.
- Byrne BM 2001. *Structural Equation Modeling With AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chen Pi-Ching 2011. *Festivals: Predicting Attendance Intention with Decision-making Factors*. PhD Thesis. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Cheng T, Chang S, Dai ZP 2015. The mediating effect of situation involvement of novelty seeking and satisfaction for Yanshuei Fireworks Festival in Taiwan. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 9(2): 154-167.
- Child D 1970. *The Essentials of Factor Analysis*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chin WW 1998. Commentary: Issues and option on structural equation modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, 20(1): 7-16.
- Churchill GA 1995. *Marketing Research*. Fort Worth: The Dryden Press.
- Cowton CJ 1998. The use of secondary data in business ethics research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(4): 423-434.
- Crompton JL, McKay SL 1997. Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2): 425-439.
- Dikmen F, Bozdağlar H 2013. Motivations for attendance at International Bellapais Music Festivals: A case study of North Cyprus. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(2): 727-739.
- Duran E, Hamarat B 2014. Festival attendees' motivations: The case of International Troia Festival. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 5(2): 146-163.
- Fielding K, Pearce PL, Hughes K 1992. Climbing Ayers Rock: Relating visitor motivation, time perception and enjoyment. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 3(2): 40-52.
- Formica S, Uysal M 1998. Market segmentation of an international cultural-historical event in Italy. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(4): 16-24.
- Getz D 1991. *Festivals, Special Events, and Tourism*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand.
- Getz D 1997. *Event Management and Event Tourism*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corp.
- Getz D 2008. Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, 29(3): 403-428.
- Giese JL, Cote JA 2000. Defining consumer satisfaction. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2000: 1-24.
- Hair JF, Anderson RE, Babin BJ, Black WC 1998. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hu L, Bentler PM 1999. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1): 1-55.
- Huang CH, Lee CH, Yeh JCC, Hsiao JPH 2014. Estimating congestion costs and segmenting motivations for recreational festivals. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(5): 558-578.
- Huang S, Lee IS 2015. Motivations for attending a multicultural festival: Visitor ethnicity matters. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 26(1): 92-95.
- Iso-Ahola E 1980. *Social Psychological Perspectives on Leisure and Recreation*. C.C. Thomas, Springfield, IL.
- Kaiser HF 1974. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39: 31-36.
- Khine MS 2013. *Application of Structural Equation Modeling in Educational Research and Practice*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Kitterlin M, Yoo M 2014. Festival motivation and loyalty factors. *Tourism and Management Studies*, 10(1): 119-126.
- Kline RB 2005. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Kruger M, Saayman M 2012. Listen to your heart: Motives for attending Roxette Live. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 13: 181-202.

- Lee CK 2000. A comparative study of Caucasian and Asian visitors to a cultural expo in an Asian Setting. *Tourism Management*, 21(2): 169-176.
- Lee CK, Lee YK, Wicks BE 2004. Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 25(1): 61-70.
- Lee J, Graefe, AR, Burns RC 2007. Examining the antecedents of destination loyalty in a forest setting. *Leisure Sciences*, 29: 463-481.
- Lee TH, Hsu FY 2013. Examining how attending motivation and satisfaction affects the loyalty for attendees at aboriginal festivals. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15: 18-34.
- Li Y, Liu Y, Zhao Y 2006. The role of market and entrepreneurship orientation and internal control in the new product development activities of Chinese firms. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35: 336-347.
- Long PT, Perdue R 1990. The economic impact of rural festivals and special events: assessing the spatial distribution of expenditures. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(4): 10-14.
- Longo M, Mura M 2007. A multidimensional measure of employees' intangibles: A managerial implementation of the tool. *Management Research News*, 30(8): 548-569.
- Matheson CM, Rimmer R, Tinsley R 2014. Spiritual attitudes and visitor motivations at the Beltane Fire Festival, Edinburgh. *Tourism Management*, 44: 16-33.
- Meehl PE 1990. Why summaries of research on psychological theories are often uninterpretable. *Psychological Reports*, 66: 195-244.
- Mcdowall S 2011. The festival in my hometown: The relationship among performance quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 12B: 269-288.
- Mclean DD, Hurd AR, Rogers NB 2005. *Kraus' Recreation and Leisure: In Modern Society*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Mohr K, Backman KF, Gahan LW, Backman SJ 1993. An investigation of festival motivations and event satisfaction by visitor type. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 1(3): 89-97.
- Moscardo G, Pearce PL 1999. Understanding ethnic tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2): 416-434.
- Nicholson RE, Pearce DG 2001. Why do people attend events: A comparative analysis of visitor motivations at four South Island events. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(4): 449-460.
- Nunnally JC 1978. *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hall.
- Oliver RA 1996. *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ozdemir G, Culha O 2009. Satisfaction and loyalty of festival visitors. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2(2): 359-373.
- Pallant J 2011. *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS*. Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Palma ML, Palma L, Aguado LF 2013. Determinants of cultural and popular celebration attendance: The case study of Seville Spring Fiestas. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 37: 87-107.
- Park KS, Reisinger Y, Kang HJ 2008. Visitors' motivation for attending the South Beach Wine and Food Festival, Miami Beach, Florida. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 25(2): 161-181.
- Pegg S, Peterson I 2010. Rethinking music festivals as a staged event: Gaining insights from understanding visitor motivations and the experiences they seek. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 11(2): 85-99.
- Popescu RI, Corbos RA 2012. The role of festivals and cultural events in the strategic development of cities: Recommendations for Urban Areas in Romania. *Informatica Economica*, 16(4): 19-28.
- Ross EL, Iso-Ahola SE 1991. Sightseeing tourists' motivations and satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18: 226-237.
- Savinovic A, Kim S, Long P 2012. Audience members' motivations satisfaction, and intention to re visit an ethnic cultural festival. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 29: 682-694.
- Saayman M 2011. Motives for attending the Cultivaria Arts Festival. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 33(1): 109-120.
- Schneider IE, Backman SJ 1996. Cross-cultural equivalence of festival motivations: A study in Jordan. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 4(3/4): 139-144.
- Sekaran U 2002. *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. United States: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Steenkamp JBEM, Trijp HCM 1991. The use of LISREL in validating marketing constructs. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 8(4): 283-299.
- Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Uysal M, Gahan LW, Martin B 1993. An examination of event motivations: A case study. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 1(1): 5-10.
- Viviers PA, Botha K, Perl C 2013. Push and pull factors of three Afrikaans Arts Festivals in South Africa. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 35(2): 211-229.
- Wan YKP, Chan SHJ 2013. Factors that affect the levels of tourists' satisfaction and loyalty towards food festivals: A case study of Macau. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15: 226-240.
- Williams K, Saayman M 2013. Relationship between travel motives and key success factors of visitors at a jazz festival. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 35(1): 183-202.
- Wimmer RD, Dominick JR 1997. *Mass Media Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Worthington RL, Whittaker TA 2006. Scale development research a content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(6): 806-838.
- Yang J, Gu Y, Cen J 2011. Festival tourists' emotion, perceived value and behavioral intents: A test of the moderating effect of festivalscape. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 12: 24-44.
- Yolal M, Cetinel F, Uysal M 2009. An examination of festival motivation and perceived benefits relationship: Eskisehir International Festival. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 10(4): 276-291.

- Yolal M, Woo E, Cetinel F, Uysal M 2012. Comparative research of motivations across different festival products. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 3(1): 66-80.
- Yoo IY, Lee TJ, Lee C 2015. Effect of health and wellness values on festival visit motivation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(2): 152-170.
- Yu AHC, Yen IY 2012. Segmenting art festival visitors by motivations. *Scientific Annals of the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi Economic Sciences*, 59(1): 213-226.
- Yuan J, Liping AC, Alastair MM, Linton S 2005. An analysis of wine festival attendees' motivations: A synergy of wine, travel and special events. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(1): 41-58.