UNDERSTANDING THE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF FESTIVALS ON COMMUNITIES

Katie Elizabeth Small

A thesis submitted to the University of Western Sydney

in partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

June 2007

_____

Date

_____

K. E. Small

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervising panel, Dr Deborah Edwards, Dr Judith Chapman and Dr Greg Teal, for giving me invaluable guidance, inspiration and support throughout this journey. To Judith, thank you for coming on board towards the end of my journey, bringing with you fresh ideas and enthusiasm for my research. I only wish I could have had you on board the whole time! To Debbie, you are a truly great supervisor! I am grateful not only for the advice, direction, and friendship you have given me, but for always having such a sincere interest in my research. You are a wonderful mentor, from whom I have learnt much over the years.

Thanks to my colleagues, past and present, many of whom have been on a similar journey, and with whom I have shared war stories and triumphs along the way. To Paula especially, for always providing much needed encouragement and advice. A special thanks to Associate Professor Robert Mellor for providing invaluable feedback on my results chapter. I would also like to acknowledge and thank the organisers of my two festivals and the residents within these communities, whose participation made this research possible.

Sincere thanks go to my very patient family and friends for tolerating the length of time I have spent on completing this thesis. To Mum and Dad, and Kell especially, thanks for understanding all the times I wasn't there for special occasions, even non-special ones, and for all the times I've been stressed, frazzled, or otherwise consumed with this thesis!

Finally, I would like to thank Steve. Thank you for giving up countless nights, weekends and holidays with your 'wife-to-be' in order that this thesis could be completed. I appreciate your patience, continued support and encouragement, and all that you did to allow me to complete this journey.

STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICATION

I, Katie Small, hereby declare that the work presented in the thesis is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, original and my own work, except as acknowledged in the text. This thesis contains no material which to a substantial extent has been accepted for a degree at this or any other university, except where due acknowledgment is made in the text of the thesis.

Signed: ……

Date: ……

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to understand the social impacts that festivals have on their host communities. It focuses on community festivals as one type of event which have a particularly strong connection to their host community. Community festivals are traditionally organised by and for the local community, and often celebrate a theme that has developed from within the community itself. Community festivals provide members of a community with opportunities to engage in socialisation, entertainment and the establishment of social networks, which can contribute to the enhancement of community cohesion and the building of social capital within a community. Additionally, they can provide tourism benefits such as increased visitation and promotion of a destination's image. However, there is the potential for negative social impacts to result from the hosting of a festival, including traffic congestion, overcrowding, vandalism and increased antisocial behaviour. This thesis seeks to understand the perceived social impacts of community festivals from the perspective of the resident population. Six important questions are addressed in this thesis: 1) what are the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals?; 2) what are a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival?; 3) are there distinct subgroups within a community who differ in their feelings towards a festival?; 4) do these subgroups hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals?; 5) can the Social Impact Perception (SIP) scale be used to measure residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals?; and 6) what are the implications of this research for the planning and management of future community festivals?

In order to explore these issues, this study draws on literature from the areas of tourism and sociology. It is from the tourism literature, more specifically on events, that community festivals are introduced as the focus of this thesis. The sociological literature on communities reinforces the importance of the 'community' in community festivals, and examines the role that festivals can play in contributing to community development, community wellbeing and the enhancement of social capital. Two community festivals were studied, one in Western Australia and the other in Victoria, Australia. Data were collected from residents in each of these two

communities at one point in time following the staging of their festival. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used, including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, observational techniques, document analysis and a residents' perceptions questionnaire.

The results revealed that there are distinct subgroups within a community who choose to be involved with their festival in a range of ways and who perceive the social impacts resulting from the festival quite differently. These subgroups have been labelled the tolerators, economically connected, attendees, avoiders and volunteers. Whilst holding varied perceptions of the positive and negative nature of the impacts and levels at which they occur, residents perceive the social impacts of community festivals to occur within six impact dimensions: inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences. Those residents who participate in the festival, either as volunteers or attendees, tend to be those who are most positive about the festival and its impacts. This participation in the community provides opportunities for social transactions, relationship building and the development of social networks, which in turn have positive outcomes for community wellbeing and the development of social capital.

This research has a number of implications for the management of future community festivals, in respect to providing a better understanding of residents' perceptions of the social impacts a festival creates; towards better satisfying the diverse needs of distinct community subgroups; and related to how festivals can be used to contribute to community wellbeing and the enhancement of social capital.

PUBLICATIONS AND CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS ARISING FROM THE DOCTORAL RESEARCH

Edwards, D., Reid, S. & Small, K. (2005). Methodological considerations in pretesting social impact questionnaires: reporting on the use of focus groups. In J. Allen (Ed.), *The Impacts of Events, Proceedings of the International Event Management Research Conference* (pp. 144-157). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management, University of Technology, Sydney.

Small, K. (2006). Application of factor analysis in the development of the social impact perception (SIP) scale. In G. B. O'Mahony & P. A. Whitelaw (Eds.), *CAUTHE 2006 "to the city and beyond…". Proceedings of the 16th Annual CAUTHE Conference* (pp. 595-606). Melbourne: Victoria University, Melbourne.

Small, K. & Edwards, D. (2006). Residents' expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. In G. Papageorgiou (Ed.), *New Directions, Challenges and Applications, Proceedings of the Cutting Edge Research in Tourism Conference*. Guildford, UK: University of Surrey, Guildford.

Small, K. (2007). Social dimensions of community festivals: an application of factor analysis in the development of the Social Impact Perception (SIP) scale. *Event Management, 11* (1-2), 45-55.

CHAPTER 1:

UNDERSTANDING THE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF FESTIVALS ON COMMUNITIES

By bringing individuals together, festivals can induce a state of 'effervescence', even 'delirium' (Durkheim, 1995).

1.1 Background to the Research

In recent years, events tourism has grown to become one of the major elements of Australia's tourism industry (Getz, 1995; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Arcodia & Robb, 2000). The appeal of events is related to the unique experiences they offer, providing an opportunity for individuals to participate in something that is not normally available as part of everyday life (Getz, 1995). The limited duration of an event adds to this uniqueness, making the opportunity to experience an event something that is only available for a specified period of time or, depending on the event, perhaps only once in a lifetime. Therefore, unlike other fixed tourist attractions that are available year-round at a destination, events occur infrequently, making attendance at an event special or unique in the eyes of those who have seized the limited opportunity to participate.

Community festivals as one type of event are a growing phenomenon in Australia and indeed worldwide, where they are increasing in number, diversity and popularity. In Australia, this growth is evident through observation and anecdotal evidence, including the increased number of community festivals listed on events calendars produced by various tourism organisations (Getz, 1991; Jago & Shaw, 1998; Jago, Chalip, Brown, Mules, & Ali, 2002). Community festivals have been depicted as "themed public occasions designed to occur for a limited duration that celebrate valued aspects of a community's way of life" (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001, p. 358). Like other types of larger events, community festivals are of limited duration. However, the key feature that distinguishes festivals from other types of events is the

"community and celebratory focus to the occurrence" (Arcodia & Robb, 2000, p. 157), often celebrating a theme which has developed from within the community itself, where a 'community' refers to a group of people who have a geographic or locational commonality (Butcher, 1993). As such, community festivals tend to reflect what is distinctive about a particular community, providing insights into the "values, interests, and aspirations" of the host community (Derrett, 2000, p. 120). Furthermore, community festivals are typically organised by the host community using local volunteers and organising committees (Getz, 1991), further reinforcing the linkages that these festivals have to their host community.

Getz (1991) defines events tourism as a segment of tourism that envisages festivals and events as tools for destination development and image building, and as an attraction for tourists. Indeed, many small communities seeking to gain benefits from tourism are choosing to do so through the hosting of a community festival (Delamere & Hinch, 1994; Higham & Ritchie, 2001). This suggests a view of events from a tourism perspective in which events represent one type of tourist attraction within a destination that can attract increased visitation (Getz, 1989, 1997; Goldblatt, 2000). When purposefully staged at an otherwise quiet time of year, an event can help to extend a destination's tourist season (Goldblatt, 2000; Allen, O'Toole, McDonnell, & Harris, 2005). Media attention on the event can further assist in promoting the destination and encouraging future visitation (Jago, Chalip, Brown, Mules, & Ali, 2003; Allen et al., 2005).

However, community festivals can provide more than these tourism benefits. They can also strengthen the social fabric of the communities in which they take place. Community festivals represent an opportunity for individual members of a community to come together to celebrate, socialise and be entertained. This occurs when individuals and groups participate in the festival and with each other through volunteering, leisure activities and opportunities for social transactions. Through their involvement, local residents are able to benefit from the development of new skills and interests, and an increased sense of community spirit and pride. Festivals can also contribute to an increased sense of community identity and belonging, and can help to enhance social cohesion and community wellbeing (Mayfield & Crompton, 1995; Arcodia & Robb, 2000; Allen et al., 2005; Duffy, 2006).

It follows that while festivals can be viewed as a type of events tourism product, considering only their tourism potential is too narrow a view (Getz & Frisby, 1988; Getz, 1989). An examination of festivals from a community development perspective is also important (Getz, 1989). For the purposes of this research, community development is considered quite broadly to include the variety of ways in which a festival contributes to the enhancement of a community's way of life (Getz, 1989). These extend beyond the tourism benefits mentioned earlier and include the social benefits to members of the host community arising from involvement and participation in the life of the community. As a celebration of the uniqueness and identity of a community, and as a provider of opportunities for social transactions and relationship building, sociologists argue the importance of community festivals to the building of social cohesion and reinforcement of social identity (Turner, 1982; Durkheim, 1995; Rao, 2001). This has implications for the wider community in terms of their overall level of wellbeing and stock of social capital. Social capital encompasses the resources and other benefits a community can gain as a result of the networks, bonds, trust and other social ties that exist within a community (Local Government Community Services Association of Australia, 1999; Putnam, 2000; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002c).

In short, the hosting of a festival creates the potential for a number of social impacts on a host community. Social impacts on a host community are those that affect day-to-day quality of life and bring changes to lifestyle, values, social interactions and identity (Glasson, Godfrey, & Goodey, 1995; Hall, 2003). Opportunities for interactions with others, entertainment and leisure activities, and an increased sense of identity and pride are all potential outcomes of a festival that may be perceived positively by locals. Festival organisers aim to foster these expectations by advertising the potential benefits a festival can bring.

However, while festivals provide a number of social benefits, they also generate the potential for negative impacts on a host community. Traffic congestion, overcrowding, road closures, vandalism and increased antisocial behaviour represent negative social impacts that have been found to disrupt the lives of locals for the

duration of a festival (Getz, 1997; Delamere, Wankel, & Hinch, 2001; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001; Small & Edwards, 2003).

Given the important role that local residents play in a community festival, often as both hosts and participants, their perceptions of the social impacts are likely to be important in determining the level of current and future support for the festival from the resident population. Consequently, there has been a growth in studies which pay attention to the social impacts that events can have (Soutar & McLeod, 1993; Delamere, 2001; Delamere et al., 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a, 2002b; Small & Edwards, 2003; Waitt, 2003; Reid, 2004; Fredline, Deery, & Jago, 2005; Small, Edwards, & Sheridan, 2005). A number of authors have measured the impacts of events because of the contribution that this information can make to improved planning and management of future events, in particular related to maintaining community support for the event (Getz, 1997; Small & Edwards, 2003; Allen et al., 2005; Bowdin, Allen, O'Toole, Harris, & McDonnell, 2006).

1.2 The Research Focus: the Social Impacts of Festivals on Communities

Despite the recognised importance of measuring the social impacts that a festival has on its host community, relatively little work has been done on developing the tools for measuring these impacts. The bulk of the research to date has tended to focus on assessing the economic impacts of events, with several tools for measuring these impacts being developed (Burns, Hatch, & Mules, 1986; McCann & Thompson, 1992; Dwyer, Mellor, Mistilis, & Mules, 2000; Crompton, Lee, & Shuster, 2001; Tyrrell & Johnston, 2001). This focus suggests a bias towards measuring the success of events in economic terms, due to the relative ease with which economic impacts can be assessed (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001), and the use of this information in seeking additional funding support for an event (Allen et al., 2005). In comparison, tools for measuring the social impacts of events have been slow to develop. In part, this can be related to the difficulty of quantifying many social impacts, which tend to be intangible in nature. Two main ways in which such intangible impacts can be dealt with are: 1) by assigning a surrogate monetary value, or 2) using a subjective approach (Getz, 1997). Burns et al. (1986) assigned surrogate monetary values to

several intangible costs and benefits in their research on the Australian Grand Prix. These surrogate monetary values are used to represent the cost of certain social impacts to the local residents; for example, a monetary value is assigned to represent the time lost by residents because of increased traffic congestion. However, it is difficult for this approach to calculate monetary values for quality of life issues such as engagement in social interactions, relationship building and community wellbeing (Allen et al., 2005). Therefore rather than attempting to quantify such intangible impacts, many researchers have examined the social impacts of events using a residents' perceptions approach (Fredline, 2000; Delamere, 2001; Delamere et al., 2001; Fredline, Jago, & Deery, 2003; Small & Edwards, 2003; Reid, 2004).

In this respect, event impact studies have tended to focus on large-scale events (Hall, 1993; Soutar & McLeod, 1993; Getz, 1995; Hall & Hodges, 1996; Fredline, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a, 2002b; Fredline et al., 2003; Waitt, 2003), with comparatively less research on smaller events, such as community festivals (Delamere, 2001; Delamere et al., 2001; Molloy, 2002; Small, 2002; Small & Edwards, 2003; Reid, 2004, 2006), and less research on the development of tools for measuring the social impacts of events (Fredline, 2000; Delamere, 2001; Delamere et al., 2001; Small, 2002; Fredline et al., 2003; Small & Edwards, 2003; Fredline et al., 2005; Small et al., 2005). Therefore there needs to be a greater focus on smaller scale events, and how they impact on their host communities. This is important given the strong relationship between a festival and its host community, which creates the potential for more intensive impacts. In addition, the development of tools for measuring the social impacts of community festivals will contribute to a greater understanding of residents' perceptions of these impacts, and to future research in this area.

To address these issues, the author undertook preliminary research towards the development of a scale for measuring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals (Small, 2002; Small & Edwards, 2003; Small et al., 2005). The scale, named the Social Impact Perception (SIP) scale, was trialled in a study of a small community festival, the Australian Festival of the Book held in the Southern Highlands of New South Wales, Australia. The scale was applied using the Delphi technique, a tool designed to draw out wider community perceptions by surveying a

smaller panel of expert members of the community. In this case, 32 stakeholders from the wider community, including tourism, government and business representatives, participated in the study. Using the Delphi technique, respondents participated in multiple iterations of the SIP scale, which assessed both their pre-festival expectations of impacts and their post-festival perceptions of impacts. The study found that the SIP scale provided useful information about a community's overall perceptions of a festival, particularly by comparing respondents' expectations and perceptions. These comparisons provided information on which expectations were perceived to have been met by the festival, including both positive and negative impacts. In addition to whether the impacts were perceived to have occurred as a result of the festival, the SIP scale also provided information on the type and level of impact the festival had on the host community. These data indicated that there may have been a set of underlying dimensions to this range of social impacts. Additionally, the research suggested that there were distinct groups within the community who perceived the impacts of the festival in different ways, as evidenced by the differing perceptions held by respondents.

Given the use of the Delphi technique and its associated small sample size, it was not feasible to refine the SIP scale through factor analysis, nor could cluster analysis be used to formally test the existence of the apparent community subgroups. What the study did suggest, however, was the value of the SIP scale in providing insights into respondents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals, highlighting the potential for expansion of the scale through further study.

This current study serves to further develop the SIP scale and to address the gaps left by previous research. This thesis will therefore advance research in the area of event impact scale development, in which there has been relatively little work undertaken. The overriding aim of this research is to answer the question: *what are the social impacts of festivals on communities?* To answer this question, the sub-aims of the research are:

1. to identify the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals;

2. to identify a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival;
3. to identify whether there are distinct subgroups within a community who differ in their feelings towards a festival;
4. to investigate whether these subgroups hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals;
5. to further develop the SIP scale as a tool for measuring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals;
6. to identify the implications of this research for the planning and management of future community festivals.

This research makes a number of important contributions. First, this research will further develop a tool for measuring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. In doing so, this research will extend the academic literature on event impact scale development. Second, the research will contribute to the existing literature on residents' perceptions of the social impacts of events, by providing a greater understanding of the social impacts resulting from community festivals. More practically, this knowledge can be used to inform policy development at the local government level, and the establishment of guidelines for the planning, development and management of future festivals. A deeper understanding of event impacts can assist event organisers and stakeholders in developing strategies aimed at minimising or controlling perceived negative impacts as identified by the host community. Such knowledge can also help to ensure that festivals reach their potential as a tool for achieving perceived positive social benefits for members of the host community. Finally, by identifying subgroups within the community who feel differently about a festival, this research has implications for event organisers in understanding and targeting the needs and concerns of diverse community subgroups.

1.3 Theoretical and Methodological Approach to the Thesis

This thesis is an investigation of the range of social impacts that community festivals have on their host community. Underpinning this research are two areas of study: tourism and sociology. From the tourism literature, it is specifically the area of

events from which community festivals are presented as one type of event, selected to provide the context in which this research will take place (Getz, 1989, 1991; Jago & Shaw, 1998; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001; Allen et al., 2005). Within the events literature, this research draws on the social impacts of events, residents' perceptions studies, social exchange theory and event impact scale development (Ap, 1990, 1992; Soutar & McLeod, 1993; Delamere, 1997, 2001; Delamere et al., 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a, 2002b; Fredline et al., 2003; Small & Edwards, 2003; Waitt, 2003; Twynam & Johnston, 2004; Fredline et al., 2005). This research also draws from the sociological literature on community to illustrate how festivals can contribute to community development, community wellbeing and the enhancement of social capital (Poplin, 1979; Willmott, 1986; Putnam, 2000; Winter, 2000b; Banks, Butcher, Henderson, & Robertson, 2003; Leonard & Onyx, 2004; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006; Ife & Tesoriero, 2006).

In order to investigate the social impacts of festivals on communities, a multiple cross-sectional design was implemented. The research was carried out on two community music festivals, one in Western Australia and the other in Victoria, Australia. Data were gathered from residents in each of these two communities at one point in time following the staging of their festival.

This research is situated within a pragmatic paradigm which stresses that the meaning and truth of an idea or proposition lies in its observable practical consequences (Cherryholmes, 1992). Pragmatism holds the research question as key and encourages the selection of the best range of methods, both qualitative and quantitative, that will help in answering the research question at hand (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Patton, 2002; Greene, Kreider, & Mayer, 2005). Therefore a mixed methods methodology, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, is used in order to answer the question, what are the social impacts of festivals on communities? This approach provides a more complete picture of the social impacts that festivals have on their host communities.

1.4 Delimitations of Scope

This research has three delimitations of scope. First, the focus of this research is specifically on the social impacts that festivals have on their host communities. Social impacts affect the day-to-day quality of life of the host population and bring changes to their lifestyle, values, social interactions and identity (Glasson et al., 1995; Hall, 2003). While recognising that festivals have the potential to create a range of impacts, including economic, environmental and political impacts (Allen et al., 2005), it is beyond the scope of this research to investigate these other dimensions. However, the researcher is mindful that these dimensions are interrelated and therefore at times, certain social impacts could be viewed as impacting on other dimensions.

Second, community festivals have been selected as the context in which to undertake research related to the social impacts of events. Community festivals provide an ideal context for advancing the study of the social impacts of events for two reasons. As community festivals represent a smaller type of event taking place in a contained geographic location, they are more manageable to investigate. Also, community festivals have been shown to have stronger links with their host community than do other larger events (Getz, 1989; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001; Derrett, 2003), which is important in determining the type and range of positive and negative social impacts on the host community. This has implications for the generalisability of the results, as small community festivals may induce a different range of impacts on their host community than would a mega-event such as an Olympic Games. Moreover, this research is conducted using two festivals with a similar theme, that is, music. Similar to the way in which community festivals will likely have a different range of impacts than other larger events, the theme itself may also influence the nature of the impacts on the host community. For example, the impacts induced by a music festival may be quite different from those that stem from another arts or cultural event. While this research does not seek to identify the influence that the theme of a festival has on the impacts created, the influence of theme is a factor that needs to be considered when generalising the findings.

Third, this research is limited to an investigation of the social impacts of community festivals, as perceived by the affected host communities. Using a residents' perceptions approach allows the resident population to make comment on the impacts they perceive a festival has on them. Moreover, whilst acknowledging that the impacts of a festival affect a range of other event stakeholders, including sponsors, media and visitors, it is beyond the scope of this research to incorporate such perspectives.

1.5 Thesis Outline

This thesis is organised into six chapters. Chapter 1 has served to introduce the research problem and the necessary background and context in which this research sits. Chapter 2 reviews the relevant academic literature that has played a role in the development of this thesis. It presents a discussion of the concepts of community, social capital and community wellbeing drawn from the sociological literature. Community festivals are introduced as one form of event, and the social impacts of events, as an extension of the literature on the social impacts of tourism, are discussed. Also presented is a review of the existing research in the field of residents' perceptions and event impact scale development, which together provide the methodological basis for the thesis.

Chapter 3 outlines the research methodology used in this thesis. It presents the research design used in gaining an understanding of the social impacts of festivals on communities. This chapter discusses the overriding research paradigm, methodology and methods used for data collection. Set within a pragmatic paradigm, the examination of two Australian community festivals using a mixed methods approach will be discussed. This chapter also explains the qualitative and quantitative methods used for data collection, including semi-structured interviews, a residents' perceptions questionnaire, focus groups, observation and document analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the research. First, this chapter outlines the demographic profile of respondents. Second, the results of the factor analysis are presented, outlining the six underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals. Third, residents' expectations and perceptions of social

impacts are discussed. Finally, five community subgroups are outlined and discussed in terms of how they differ in their perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.

Discussion of the results is presented in Chapter 5. This chapter provides the reader with an overview of what has been achieved with respect to answering the overriding research question, what are the social impacts of festivals on communities? It does this by addressing each of the sub-aims outlined for the thesis.

Chapter 6 concludes the thesis, discussing the implications of this research for the planning and management of future community festivals. The contributions of this research are discussed, and suggestions for further research are proposed based on the developments made in this thesis.

1.6 Summary

Communities seeking to provide opportunities for their members to engage in socialisation, entertainment and the establishment of social networks are often looking towards community festivals as one way of achieving these outcomes. A community festival also provides a number of opportunities for the enhancement of community cohesion and the building of social capital within a community. In addition to these positive social impacts, there is the potential for negative social impacts to result from the hosting of a festival. It is important to understand the full range of social impacts that a festival has on its host community, such that this knowledge can be used to improve the planning and management of the festival in the future. Additionally, the encouragement of positive impacts which have wider social benefits for the host community may contribute to greater community wellbeing, community development and the enhancement of social capital.

Research is therefore required to identify the social impacts resulting from community festivals and to understand how members of the host community perceive these impacts. This research will assist in developing a tool to measure residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals, which allows residents to communicate whether a range of impacts has a positive or negative effect

on them. This research also seeks to identify any subgroups within a community who may feel differently about a festival, and aims to understand the reasons and factors behind these differences.

This chapter has presented a background to the research and has introduced the research questions and issues. A summary of the methodology and contributions to be made by the thesis were provided. This chapter delimited the scope and boundaries of the research, and outlined the structure of the thesis, highlighting what is to follow in the next five chapters. With the foundation laid, chapter 2 will now present a review of the relevant literature relating to the sociological literature on community, and the tourism literature on events and the social impacts of events.

CHAPTER 2:

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

As introduced in chapter 1, community festivals are the focus of this thesis. Community festivals represent a small scale type of event, taking place in a contained geographic location or community. Community festivals have strong links with their host community, whose members are not only involved in the organisation of the festival, but who attend it as a community celebration. It is also the host community that is impacted, both positively and negatively, as a result of a festival.

This chapter presents the literature relevant to the development of this thesis. Important concepts which underpin the thesis, including community, the area of events and the social impacts of events and their measurement, are discussed.

2.2 Community

The concept of community is central to a discussion of community festivals and their social impacts. Given the several decades over which the term 'community' has been subject to research, definition and debate, it is not surprising that there is no one single definition of it. However, three characteristics have been identified in a number of definitions of community and therefore warrant further discussion: 1) geographic location; 2) social interaction; and 3) common ties (Bell & Newby, 1971; Bernard, 1973; Poplin, 1979; Willmott, 1986, 1989; Crow & Allan, 1994).

Geographic location represents the first characteristic of community, referring to a "cluster of people living within a specific geographic area" (Poplin, 1979, p. 9). Members of a community can be viewed as a group of people with something in common, with that commonality being explained in geographic terms (Willmott, 1986). A second defining characteristic of community is that it consists of a number of people interacting with one another (Poplin, 1979). Such interaction is typically

structured around a set of common interests held by members of the community (Willmott, 1986; Taylor, 2003). Common interests can include religion or cultural heritage, occupation, leisure pursuits or any common experiences or interests that draw members of a community together, thus forming the basis for social relationships and interactions between members of a community. Further, beyond the geographic location and social interactions, a third defining characteristic is that a community represents a set of common ties or bonds between people (Poplin, 1979). Common ties are those aspects of a community, such as shared goals, values or norms, through which people can identify with each other and their community (Willmott, 1986; Taylor, 2003). In identifying with their community through these common ties or bonds, community members can gain a sense of identity and a feeling of security and belonging. The sense of identity that a person can gain from connecting with their community should not be underestimated. As Willmott (1986) explains, in an otherwise complex world certain people may heavily rely on their sense of identification with other members of a community as the key to making sense of their lives.

Butcher (1993) also outlines three meanings of the concept of community which although distinct, are each interrelated. He defines these as the 'descriptive', 'value', and 'active' meanings of community. The first meaning of community proposed by Butcher (1993) is the descriptive community, which depicts community as a group of people who have something in common. This commonality between people can be either geographic or interest-related. Butcher's descriptive meaning of community is similar to the elements of geographic location and social interaction outlined above as two characteristics featuring in a majority of community definitions. Thus Butcher's (1993) descriptive meaning of community highlights a community as a place in which people come together because they have a geographic proximity and/or share common interests which encourage social interaction.

Secondly, Butcher (1993) proposes a meaning of community as 'value', recognising that solidarity, participation and coherence are three intrinsic values of communities. Solidarity refers to the emotional relationships that exist between community members. Participation refers to shared activities of community members that help realise common goals and aspirations. Coherence refers to the adoption of a set of

meanings and values by individual members of the community that contribute some overall sense of their world. This 'value' sense of community builds on the social interaction and common ties aspects of community, as discussed previously. This meaning of community as 'value' suggests what it is that community represents to its members, that is, a place where people share similar values.

The third meaning of community outlined by Butcher (1993) is the idea of 'active community'. An active community is represented by collective action undertaken by groups of people with either a geographic or interest-related commonality, which embraces one or more of the community values of solidarity, participation or coherence. Collective action is typically undertaken by community groups, networks or organisations, working together towards a defined goal or purpose. This meaning of an 'active' community emphasises how people behave and act in relation to their common interests and shared values.

The concept of community is relevant to community festivals for a number of reasons. First, a community festival is bound by the geographic location in which it takes place, i.e. within a specific community. Second, not only does the community host the festival in a geographic sense, but its members, the host population, "organise the event, support it through volunteer labour, and attend it as a community celebration" (Getz, 1995, p. 129). This represents an 'active community' that comes together around shared interests and values to realise a common goal of organising and staging a festival in their community. Third, by hosting the festival in their community, members of the local population must cope with the potential impacts of the festival, both positive and negative.

When a community comes together to undertake collective action, such as for the purpose of staging a community festival, positive outcomes for the community can be realised. One such outcome can be an increased level of community wellbeing, as explored in the following section.

2.2.1 Community Wellbeing

Community wellbeing is a concept that is difficult to define, and for which there are many definitions. The definition adopted here is that which sees community wellbeing as "an optimal quality of healthy community life which meets the needs of people living together in communities" (Rural Assist Information Network, 2006). Community wellbeing has also been described as the quality of life within a community, as perceived by its own members (Cuthill, 2002; Beeton, 2006). The Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001) depicts wellbeing as having both individual and community dimensions. The level of involvement of an individual in their community is positively related to both their individual wellbeing and also the wellbeing of the wider community (Ahlbrandt & Cunningham, 1979; Christakopoulou, Dawson, & Gari, 2001; Yarra Ranges Shire Council, 2006). At the individual level, a person's wellbeing is influenced by their connections to, and interactions with other members of the community.

For people to maintain their wellbeing they must become actively involved in transactions with others. However, it is the wider community, which extends beyond an individual's immediate circle of family and friends, which is the source of the social and communication fabric that enables community interactions (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001). In short, a community plays an important role in contributing to the wellbeing of its members by providing an environment in which social interactions and transactions can occur. For many people, beyond their immediate circle of family and friends, it is their community to which they turn for support, guidance, social interaction and relationship building (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001; Yarra Ranges Shire Council, 2006). In this way, people develop a sense of belonging, self-worth, involvement in, and contribution to the life of the community, and the place to build relationships with others. These relationships and interactions are important precursors to wellbeing at a community level (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001; Christakopoulou et al., 2001).

Community festivals, through their provision of entertainment and socialisation opportunities, enable individuals and groups to participate in the community and with each other through volunteering, taking part in leisure activities and

strengthening social networks, which help in achieving wellbeing outcomes for the community. Additionally, community festivals have the potential to encourage the development of social capital within a community, as outlined in the following section.

2.2.2 Social Capital

Communities provide a forum for socialisation, entertainment and relationship building through the support of a range of community activities (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001). Any type of medium that encourages social interaction between members of a community has potential inherent value for a community. A number of authors recognise this value as a key aspect of social capital. Early research into the concept of social capital was undertaken by Pierre Bourdieu and James Coleman, although Robert Putnam can be credited with popularising the concept (Schuller, Baron, & Field, 2000). Putnam (2000) defines social capital as the "connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them". Similar to the ways in which physical and human capital can provide value, social networks can also add value to both individuals and groups within a community (Putnam, 2000). The value to a community is expressed as the resources and other benefits which become available as a result of the networks, bonds, other social ties and trust that exist within a community (Local Government Community Services Association of Australia, 1999; Putnam, 2000; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002c).

Key themes in the growing literature on social capital include networks, social norms, trust and reciprocity. Each of these is discussed to highlight their relationship to social capital.

Networks

A theme that is central to social capital is the presence of networks or the relationships which exist among people. A network is typically formed between people who have something in common, such as a hobby, sport, occupation or religion (Productivity Commission, 2003). Membership and active participation in a network provide people with opportunities for social interactions and transactions.

Networks are important for the generation of social capital since it is through interactions with others that social capital can be built; "social capital cannot be generated by individuals acting on their own" (Onyx & Bullen, 2000, p. 106).

Social Norms

Social norms are another key aspect of social capital. Social norms are typically unwritten rules that provide guidance on behaviours that are acceptable or unacceptable, and those that are more or less valued within a community (Leonard & Onyx, 2004). Some common social norms include abiding by the law, not littering and showing respect for elders (Productivity Commission, 2003). Social norms often exist where there is a high level of trust in a community, as people can be trusted to act in accordance with the established social norms, rather than requiring that more formal rules for behaviour be in place.

Trust

Trust is defined as "the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest and cooperative behaviour, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community" (Fukuyama, 1995, p. 26). In other words, individuals within a community who are trusting expect that other members of their community will act in an open, predictable and supportive manner. The existence of trust within a community helps to facilitate the building of social networks, which provide opportunities for people to engage in social interactions. In this way, trust can be seen as important to the enhancement of social capital.

Reciprocity

Central to the concept of reciprocity is the ethic of "do unto others as you would have them do unto you" (Productivity Commission, 2003). A member of a community that embraces reciprocity is able to undertake an act or service to the benefit of another, with the expectation that this favourable act will be reciprocated. Often it is not known when or by whom this act will be reciprocated, but there is an expectation that this reciprocation will in fact eventuate (Putnam, 2000; Leonard & Onyx, 2003). In this way, reciprocity can be seen as an important builder of trust within a community. In some communities, reciprocity can also come to be viewed as a social norm (Leonard & Onyx, 2004).

The combination of networks, social norms, trust and reciprocity contributes to a high level of social capital within a community (Leonard & Onyx, 2004). Two main types of social capital are discussed in the literature: bonding social capital and bridging social capital. Bonding social capital represents ties that bind a homogenous group together, providing them with a strong sense of identity, trust and belonging (Putnam, 2000; Schuller et al., 2000; Leonard & Onyx, 2004). 'Bonding' social relations typically exist among family members and close friends (Cullen & Whiteford, 2001; Harper, 2001). Bonding social capital represents strong ties and a high level of support for group members. In contrast, bridging social capital serves to create links between heterogeneous groups (Putnam, 2000; Schuller et al., 2000). Bridging social capital can bring people together from different groups within a community, for example, by connecting people of different ages, genders or religions (Leonard & Onyx, 2004). Therefore while bonding social capital has benefits for the tight-knit group, bridging social capital is inclusive of more people and groups within a community. This is not to say that one form is better than the other, as both provide benefits to involved members.

One way of developing the stock of social capital within a community is through having a strong 'civil society'. Civil society refers to "any voluntarily formed association of people with common interests or purposes" (Ife & Tesoriero, 2006, p. 17) and includes service clubs such as Lions and Rotary, and recreational or sporting clubs. Active involvement in a community group, club or activity is an important indicator of the stock of social capital within a community (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2000; Putnam, 2000; Winter, 2000a). These associations provide opportunities for networking among their members, enabling active participation in their community (Leonard & Onyx, 2004). Community organisations also contribute to the development of social capital where they encourage volunteer involvement. In fact, volunteering is one of the best ways of generating social capital (Leonard & Onyx, 2004) as it involves engaging in social interactions and relationships with others, thus establishing relationship networks. Volunteering around a common cause often brings people together from diverse backgrounds, which assists in enhancing bridging social capital and, therefore, social cohesion in a community. Voluntary action and involvement in community clubs and organisations represent

transactions during which the stock of social capital can be built. Therefore the presence of a rich array of service, recreational, sporting or other community organisations indicates that social capital within a community is likely to be high.

Although social capital can be enhanced through formal social networks such as organisations and associations, informal connections linking members of a community are far more common, and also contribute to the stock of social capital (Putnam, 2000). According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001), in order to grow and develop the stock of social capital, community members must become involved in transactions with others. It is daily interactions and even informal social exchanges between members of a community, or between an individual and their immediate circle of family and friends, that can build trust and reciprocity, in turn enhancing social capital (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001, 2002d).

Social capital is not just valuable for the people involved in making the social contacts and connections but can also have value for the wider community (Putnam, 2000). Using volunteers as an example, not only do the participants receive personal benefits such as satisfying their own motivations for community involvement and socialising, but volunteering can be seen as making "a contribution to the wellbeing of others and the community at large" (Leonard & Onyx, 2004, p. 74). For example, active members of a service club such as Rotary or Lions benefit individually from the social interactions and new relationships gained as a result of their involvement, but their fundraising and other efforts help those in the wider community.

Thus far the building of social capital has been discussed without mention of the ability of the stock of social capital to be diminished. Social capital is similar to economic capital in that it has a value which increases and decreases over time (Rojek, 2005). However, unlike economic capital that can be stored and allowed to accumulate value, the stock and value of social capital is increased when it is used, and decreases when it is not used (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002d). Using social capital serves to reinforce the established networks and levels of trust within a community. For example, a social transaction that increases goodwill between people and builds social capital is voluntary work. On the other hand, a negative social transaction that depletes trust between community members and diminishes

social capital is crime. Therefore, the stock of social capital will accumulate or diminish depending on the types of social transactions occurring between people (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001).

Social capital cannot be built without the necessary opportunities for the establishment of social networks and social interactions between members of the community (Falk & Kilpatrick, 2000). Community festivals are one type of activity that provides such opportunities for social exchanges between people. Community festivals enable individuals and groups to participate in the community and with each other through volunteering, leisure activities and opportunities for social transactions. By encouraging active relationships and interactions with others, community festivals can be seen as increasing the stock of social capital within a community.

2.3 Events

In this section, the area of events is profiled in order to establish the context of this research. First to be discussed is the typology of events and the place of community festivals in this typology. Second is a discussion of the social impacts of events, drawing on the previous research conducted in this area.

2.3.1 Events: Defining the Field

Worldwide, events are a growing phenomenon, increasing in number and popularity (Crompton & McKay, 1997; Getz, 1997; Gursoy, Kim, & Uysal, 2004). Events are a unique form of tourism product, which range in scale from mega-events at one end of the scale to small community festivals at the other (Getz, 1989). They showcase a variety of themes including food and wine, arts, music, sport, religion, history and culture (Getz, 1991, 1997; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001). This diversity of size and theme makes it difficult to produce one definition for events which encompasses the entire range, and therefore the broad term ‘event’ is commonly used to refer to a wide variety of celebrations (Getz, 1989; Allen et al., 2005).

While there are numerous definitions of the term ‘event’ (Getz, 1991; Jago & Shaw, 1998; Arcodia & Robb, 2000), one definition that is commonly used is proposed by

Getz (1989, p. 125) who defines an event as "a celebration or display of some theme to which the public is invited for a limited time only, annually or less frequently". Another definition is proposed by Jago and Shaw (1998, p. 29) who define an event as "a one time or infrequently occurring event of limited duration that provides the consumer with a leisure and social opportunity beyond everyday experience". This definition highlights the fact that an event is an opportunity beyond that which is available everyday, and draws attention to the leisure and social aspects from the perspective of the consumer or participant. This definition is of particular value to this research, as it focuses on the leisure and social opportunities which can benefit a local community.

Regardless of their size and theme, events share a common set of features which help distinguish them from other tourism products. Getz (1991) describes the characteristics most important to defining events as including the following:

- An event is open to the public.
- The main purpose of an event is the celebration or display of a specific theme.
- Events take place annually or less frequently.
- Opening and closing dates predetermine the length of an event.
- An event program consists of one or more separate activities.
- Events are largely intangible, and it is the actual experience of participating in an event that is most important.

Within the events sector there are a number of event types including 'mega-events', 'hallmark events' and 'local/community events'. Within this typology of events, size is used as the defining dimension, with mega-events representing one end of the spectrum, and local/community events representing the other. A discussion of this typology of events is presented below.

Mega-Events

Mega-events represent the pinnacle of the events scale, being the largest events in terms of both their size and significance (Allen et al., 2005). For an event to be classified as a mega-event, it must meet two main criteria: attracting at least one million visitors and incurring capital costs of at least $500 million (Getz, 1997). An

additional important feature which differentiates mega-events from other types of events is that due to their size and significance, they are capable of affecting more than just a community or country, and often receive worldwide media coverage and attention (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001; Allen et al., 2005). Given these criteria, it is difficult for many events to fit successfully in this category, apart from events such as an Olympic Games, which represent one of the best examples of a mega-event.

Hallmark Events

Hallmark events have been described as "major, one time or recurring events of limited duration, developed primarily to enhance the awareness, appeal and profitability of a tourism destination in the short and/or long term. Such events rely for their success on uniqueness, status, or timely significance to create interest and attract attention" (Ritchie, 1984, p. 2). The key distinguishing feature of a hallmark event is that it is identified with a particular place, so much so that over time, the event and the place come to be inseparable (Getz, 1997; Jago & Shaw, 1998; Allen et al., 2005). This has become the situation for international events such as Carnivale in Rio de Janeiro, and Oktoberfest in Munich, Germany. Australian hallmark events which have become linked to a place include the Australian Country Music Festival at Tamworth, and the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras.

Local/Community Events

Van Der Wagen and Carlos (2005) believe that "the most common events are community related". Many communities now host a festival or event designed to offer social and entertainment opportunities primarily for the local community (De Bres & Davis, 2001; Allen et al., 2005). Community festivals are one type of local event that originates from within a particular segment of a community wishing to celebrate particular features of its way of life or history (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001). Community festivals are usually small in scale and size, and represent the point "where community and its outward manifestations of image and identity collide" (Derrett, 2000, p. 120). Community festivals are defined as "themed public occasions designed to occur for a limited duration that celebrate valued aspects of a community's way of life" (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001, p. 358). A further distinguishing feature of community festivals is that they are typically organised by the host community, using local volunteers and organising committees (Getz, 1991).

The host community is also typically responsible for identifying a particular theme or way of life that they wish to celebrate in the community festival, reflecting the community's culture and sense of itself (Brown & James, 2004; Derrett, 2004). It has been suggested that a greater level of community acceptance of the festival is likely when the community has been actively involved in the development of the festival's theme (Derrett, 2004).

Whilst special events are classified according to their size and scale, with some common types being mega-events, hallmark events and local/community events, these classifications are not strict nor consistently used, and therefore distinctions between event types are often blurred (Allen et al., 2005). For the purpose of this thesis, the term 'event' is used to represent the entire scope of events, from mega-events down to small community festivals. Where discussion refers specifically to 'community festivals', representing the focus of this research, such specific terminology will be used. The following section will present previous research which has been carried out in relation to the social impacts of events.

2.3.2 Social Impacts of Events

Research into the impacts of events is increasing because of the growing number of events being held, and because of a growing recognition of the impacts, both positive and negative, that these events can have on a host community (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001). The initial focus of much event impact research was on the economic dimension, and as such, a substantial amount of research to date has focused on assessing the economic impacts of events (Burns et al., 1986; McCann & Thompson, 1992; Dwyer et al., 2000; Crompton et al., 2001; Tyrrell & Johnston, 2001). Emphasis is often placed on this aspect because, in part, "the success of a festival or event is commonly measured in terms of its economic contribution to event stakeholders, the community and the region" (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001, p. 364). An emphasis on the economic impacts can also be related to the relative ease with which such impacts can be assessed (Allen et al., 2005). More recently however, there have been calls for more attention to be given to other types of impacts, considered just as important in calculating the overall success or outcomes of an event (Hall, 1993; Allen et al., 2005). This stems from a recognition that it is counterproductive "to

concentrate on the economic dimension to the exclusion of other perspectives on festivals and events" (Getz, 1991, p. 39).

Consequently, there has been a growth in studies which pay greater attention to the social impacts that events can have (Soutar & McLeod, 1993; Delamere, 1997, 2001; Delamere et al., 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a, 2002b; Fredline et al., 2003; Small & Edwards, 2003; Waitt, 2003; Reid, 2004; Fredline et al., 2005; Small et al., 2005). A focus on the social impacts of events on a host community is increasingly necessary, since dissatisfaction amongst the community is likely to have negative implications for the current success and long-term sustainability of an event. In small communities, local residents play an important part in the staging of festivals, often taking on roles of both host and participant. Not only does the host community provide many of the businesses, facilities and other public places in which a community festival is held, but members of the host community are a resource in themselves, with many working in tourism or hospitality businesses, at the festival, or as volunteers (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001). Community festivals are an opportunity for community members to come together to socialise and be entertained, to enhance their sense of belonging and community identity, and create an increased sense of community wellbeing by way of enhancing their relationship networks and social capital. For individual community members, personal benefits such as increased self-esteem, a sense of contribution and self-worth, and personal and life satisfaction can result from involvement in a community festival. Event organisers need to understand the perceived positive and negative social impacts of an event on the host community, so that they can develop future strategies to capitalise on the positive impacts and minimise the negative impacts. By doing so, they are more likely to retain the support of the local community, which is an essential ingredient to the success of an event, especially small-scale community festivals.

The established literature on the social impacts of tourism is the main body of knowledge from which literature on the social impacts of events has emerged. Early studies recognised that tourism can induce both positive and negative social impacts upon its host destination and community (Pizam, 1978; Belislie & Hoy, 1980; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Inskeep, 1991; Ross, 1992; King, Pizam, & Milman, 1993; Archer & Cooper,

1994; Crandall, 1994; Godfrey & Clarke, 2000). Influential work by Doxey (1975) suggested that residents' responses to tourism will change over time, passing through a series of stages (Mathieson & Wall, 1982). These stages were outlined in Doxey's Irritation Index model (1975), which shows residents moving through stages of euphoria, apathy, irritation, and finally antagonism, based on continued exposure to tourism's social impacts. Social impacts are defined as the 'people impacts' of tourism with a focus on the impacts on the host community. Social impacts affect the day-to-day quality of life of local residents and can induce changes to their lifestyle, values, social interactions and identity (Glasson et al., 1995; Hall, 2003). Early studies on the impacts of events identified the likely range of social impacts from the previous tourism impact literature (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). It was found that although events can create similar social impacts to other forms of tourism, event impacts are often more specific than those of general tourism, particularly given the strong relationship between a festival and its host community (Delamere, 2001).

The hosting of a festival provides opportunities for a wide range of positive social impacts on residents of the host community including opportunities for celebration and entertainment as well as social interaction with other members of the community or with visitors to the community (Delamere et al., 2001; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001; Molloy, 2002; Allen et al., 2005). Festivals encourage greater community participation in activities related to sports or the arts, or activities associated with the event theme (Ritchie, 1984; Getz, 1997; Dwyer et al., 2000; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001). Community festivals can also play an important role in strengthening the traditions and values held by residents, due in part to an increased sense of community spirit and pride that may result from the hosting of a successful festival (Ritchie, 1984; Getz, 1997; Delamere et al., 2001; Derrett, 2004; Allen et al., 2005). Where the festival is run by the local community, benefits to be gained by involved residents also include the development of new skills, a sense of identity, self-esteem and the formation of new relationships and social networks (Getz, 1991). In addition, community festivals can encourage increased levels of volunteerism within a community, as well as further community group activity of various kinds (Ritchie, 1984).

Festivals and events, however, can impact negatively upon a community if they are not planned and managed correctly (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001). Negative social impacts include traffic congestion, parking problems, noise pollution and litter (Hall, 1993; Getz, 1997; Dwyer et al., 2000; Delamere et al., 2001; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001; Allen et al., 2005; Kim & Petrick, 2005), as well as crowding in local shops and overcrowded local facilities (Getz, 1997; Delamere et al., 2001; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001). Festivals may also induce social problems such as crime and vandalism (Delamere et al., 2001; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001) and anti-social behaviour (Hall, 1993; Getz, 1997; Allen et al., 2005). Disruption to everyday life and normal routines, challenges to traditional morals and values, and a loss of identity are also potential negative social impacts (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001; Allen et al., 2005). Allen, O'Toole, McDonnell and Harris (2002, p. 27) suggest, however, that local communities are often "prepared to put up with temporary inconvenience and disruption because of the excitement which they [festivals] generate, and the long-term expectation of improved facilities and profile". This would depend, presumably, upon the scale of the negative impacts that had to be endured in relation to the benefits received. For example, Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) studied residents' perceptions of the social impacts of tourism on the Gold Coast, and found that residents were prepared to tolerate certain negative impacts affecting them individually, because of the other positive impacts that accrue to the wider community. They term this phenomenon 'altruistic surplus'. The existence of an altruistic surplus has since been supported in the events literature, with research confirming that residents will tolerate the difficulties of finding car parking and the increased number of people in their town, given that they recognise the wider perceived positive impacts experienced by the community at large (Small & Edwards, 2003).

In the tourism literature, social impacts have typically been classified and referred to as positive or negative. This classification of social impacts as positive or negative has been adopted in early event impact studies, given that many of the social impacts have been drawn from the tourism literature. More recently, however, event impact studies are coming to recognise that impacts are not perceived in the same way by all residents in a community (Small, 2002; Small & Edwards, 2003). In fact, while certain impacts are perceived to be positive by some residents, others will perceive

these same impacts to be negative. Reid (2006) has since argued that the impacts of events should be defined by those who are impacted, rather than imposing a predefined, value-laden approach. That is, the impacted community should assign their own positive or negative labels to reflect their perceptions of the types of impacts a festival has on them. This issue in the literature suggests that more studies need to be done in the area of residents' perceptions of event impacts, in order to understand how residents perceive the impacts of a festival, and which in particular are perceived as having both positive and negative impacts.

2.4 Measuring the Social Impacts of Events

2.4.1 Residents' Perceptions of Social Impacts

Previous research into residents' perceptions of social impacts has focused on both the impacts of general tourism development (Pizam, 1978; Belislie & Hoy, 1980; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ross, 1992; Johnson, Snepenger, & Akis, 1994; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Teye, Sonmez, & Sirakaya, 2002; Tosun, 2002; Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003; Ryan & Cooper, 2004; Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005) and, more recently, into the impacts related specifically to specialist areas. One of these areas is the impacts of events (Ritchie & Lyons, 1987; Ritchie & Lyons, 1990; Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997; Fredline & Faulkner, 1998; Delamere, 2001; Delamere et al., 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a; Fredline et al., 2003; Small & Edwards, 2003; Waitt, 2003; Twynam & Johnston, 2004; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Small et al., 2005; Small & Edwards, 2006).

A residents' perceptions approach allows residents to make comment on the impacts that tourism development or a specific event has had on them. Such an approach is particularly important for the examination of social impacts that are often difficult to measure objectively since they cannot be easily quantified. Moreover, if residents perceive that certain impacts are occurring, it is this belief rather than any objective reality that will be important in affecting their attitudes and behaviours towards tourism or an event (Hall, 2003). Social impacts are therefore best examined through an investigation of residents' perceptions (Fredline et al., 2003).

Advocates of residents' perceptions research typically cite two important reasons for such studies to be undertaken. First, residents' perceptions studies are seen to be important because of the role they can play in providing essential information for planning agencies. "The perceptions and attitudes of residents towards the impacts of tourism are likely to be an important planning and policy consideration for the successful development, marketing, and operation of existing and future tourism programs and projects" (Ap, 1992, p. 665). Second, some argue that a host community that is positively disposed to tourism will enhance the experience of tourists and contribute to the destination's attractiveness (Madrigal, 1995; Kang, Long, & Perdue, 1996; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Waitt, 2003). In line with this, a lack of support within a resident population could threaten the existence of future tourism in a destination (Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a). These findings are equally applicable to events as they are to tourism more generally. Residents' perceptions of the social impacts of tourism or an event need to be considered throughout the planning process in order to minimise identified negative impacts and optimise benefits for the host community (Kang et al., 1996; Brunt & Courtney, 1999).

Theoretical Approaches

Two theoretical approaches used in understanding variations in residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism and events are social representations theory and social exchange theory. Social representations have been described as the "concepts, statements and explanations originating in daily life during the course of inter-individual communications" (Moscovici, 1981, p. 181). Social representations are comprised of bundles of preconceived ideas, values and images and relate to how people think and feel about occurrences in the world around them (Moscovici, 1981). Social representations theory has been suggested as a basis for understanding residents' perceptions by examining the effect of the three main sources of social representations, these being direct experience, social interaction and the media.

Social exchange theory has been used by numerous researchers, either implicitly or explicitly, as the theoretical basis for understanding residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism and/or events (Ap, 1990; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1990; Ap, 1992; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997; Chen, 2000; Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002; Kayat, 2002; Waitt, 2003; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). Social exchange theory is a

logical and intuitive sociological theory, which is useful in explaining the diversity in residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in relation to factors including economic dependence or involvement in tourism, proximity to tourist activities, level of contact with tourists, identification with the theme and level of participation. Social exchange theory is concerned with understanding the exchange of resources, whether material, social, or psychological in nature, between individuals and groups in an interaction situation (Ap, 1992, p. 668). Thus from a tourism and/or events perspective, this theory can be applied to understand the exchange of resources that takes place during host-guest interactions. As part of this interaction with tourists, residents are involved in a series of exchanges and it is suggested that the outcome of these exchanges, in terms of the expected benefits and costs, will determine residents evaluation of tourism as either positive or negative (Ap, 1992; Andereck et al., 2005). If residents perceive themselves to have benefited from the tourism exchange then they should have positive perceptions. If residents perceive tourism (or an event) to be associated with negative impacts that outweigh any benefits, then they are likely to have negative perceptions. Ap (1992) argues that positive or negative evaluations are thought to be made on the basis of four base conditions: 1) rationality - residents who perceive rewards stemming from the exchange are likely to evaluate it as overwhelmingly positive; 2) satisficing benefits - whilst negative impacts can be recognised, the overall evaluation is likely to be positive if residents perceive the positive as outweighing the negative; 3) reciprocity - perceived rewards should equal residents' willingness to carry the costs; and 4) the justice principle - residents are more likely to have positive perceptions if they feel they are getting reasonable returns for their support or participation. Thus social exchange theory advocates that residents who perceive the benefits to be greater than the costs are more likely to participate in the exchange process with tourists/visitors, and in turn, are more likely to be supportive of the development of tourism or an event in their community (Chen, 2000).

The application of social exchange theory relies on an understanding of residents' perceptions of impacts and the factors affecting these perceptions, which can be discovered through either extrinsic or intrinsic studies.

Extrinsic and Intrinsic Studies

Residents' perception studies are generally one of two types: 'extrinsic' or 'intrinsic' (Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997). Extrinsic studies are those that recognise "variables that affect resident reactions at the macro level in the sense that they have a common impact on the community as a whole" (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000, p. 765). In an events context, there are a number of extrinsic variables that are thought to affect residents' perceptions of impacts. These include the age of the event, its size relative to the size of the community, the theme of the event, and the spatial concentration and infrastructure requirements of the event (Fredline, 2000).

Age of Event

The stage of an event's development, in terms of the number of years it has been running, is one factor that may affect residents' perceptions of the event's impacts. It has been suggested that over time, where an event has been held for a number of years, residents' perceptions of impacts often become less negative (Fredline, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). This can be attributed to the increasing skill of the event organisers, who over time learn to better manage and minimise the negative impacts of the event. It can also be related to the ability of local residents to adapt to the event, developing their own coping mechanisms such as avoiding the event or leaving town, or simply accepting a certain level of negative impacts which they can tolerate for the period of the festival (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000).

Event Size

It is logical to consider the relationship between the size of an event and the type and level of social impacts it is likely to induce (Fredline, 2000). That is, larger events would be expected to create more impacts than would a small community festival. However, it is not only the size of an event that will determine this but the size of the event in relation to the size of the host community in which it is taking place (Hall, 1989). With respect to social impacts, whilst a small number of visitors entering a community with a large resident population may have minimal impacts, large numbers of visitors entering a community with a small resident population generally provide greater scope for social impacts.

Event Theme

An additional consideration that will affect residents' perceptions of an event's impacts is the degree to which they see the theme as reflecting and celebrating valued aspects of their community's way of life. "The more an event is seen by its host community as emerging from within rather than being imposed on them, the greater that community's acceptance of the event will be" (Derrett 2004, p. 33). Therefore it is seen as counterproductive to impose a theme on a community, given the likelihood that without its roots in the community, the festival may not be embraced by the locals, thereby putting its success and long-term sustainability at risk (Hall, 1989; Getz, 1991).

It is also important that the community is linked to the festival, not only through its theme but also through its organisation. A key feature of community festivals is that they are typically organised by the host community, using local volunteers and organising committees (Getz, 1991). While the organisers will have their own understanding of the goals and purpose of a festival, it is important that this understanding is shared by the wider community (Gursoy et al., 2004). Where the organisers have a different vision for the festival to that held by the wider community, continuing community support for the festival may not be gained.

Spatial Concentration of the Event

A consideration of the location(s) of an event within a community is related to the likely range of social impacts created and how they might be spread throughout the host community. Where an event uses numerous venues spread throughout the community, the social impacts may also be spread over this wider area (Fredline, 2000). Conversely, where an event is held in one confined area of the community, the impacts are also confined (Murphy, 1985). Confining the impacts of an event to one area is debatable as not only are the negative impacts confined, but consequently the positive impacts are also likely to be confined to this area. Therefore the spatial concentration of an event within a community is likely to affect not only the range of impacts that occur but also how far-reaching these impacts might be.

The age of an event, its size, theme and spatial concentration represent the extrinsic variables thought to affect residents' perceptions of the social impacts of an event.

Extrinsic studies are important in recognising the variables that affect residents' perceptions of impacts at a community-wide level, suggesting that impacts will affect all members of the community in the same way. Also useful, however, are intrinsic studies, which recognise "that the host community is heterogeneous and perceptions of impacts may vary according to variations in the characteristics and circumstances of individuals" (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000, p. 765). Intrinsic variables thought to influence residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism or events within their community include economic dependence, proximity to tourist activities, level of contact with tourists, socio-demographic characteristics, identification with the theme, and level of participation.

Economic Dependence

A number of studies have considered the role that an individual's economic dependence or involvement in tourism has on their perceptions of impacts. A common finding was that positive perceptions are associated with a direct economic dependence on the tourism industry or a specific event (Rothman, 1978; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Schluter & Var, 1988; Schroeder, 1992; King et al., 1993; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Jurowski et al., 1997; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Weaver & Lawton, 2001).

Proximity

Several studies have found that the closer residents live to the tourist activity, the more negative are their perceptions of impacts (Pizam, 1978; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Korca, 1996; Cegielski & Mules, 2002). Conversely, other studies have found that close proximity to tourist activities leads to more positive perceptions of impacts (Belislie & Hoy, 1980; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Keogh, 1990). Perdue, Long and Allen (1990) suggest that the closer a person lives to the tourist activity, the more they are going to be impacted by it, both positively and negatively. Thus while they may receive a greater portion of the positive impacts than those living further away, they will also experience a greater share of the negative impacts.

Contact

The level of contact with tourists is another factor that influences resident perceptions of the impacts of tourism. Pizam (1978) found that a high level of contact with tourists is associated with negative perceptions of the impacts of

tourism. In contrast, other studies have found that a high level of tourist contact results in positive perceptions of impacts (Rothman, 1978; Korca, 1996; Weaver & Lawton, 2001). What these opposing findings tell us is that consideration must be given to the type of contact with the tourist, for example, fleeting contact as compared to in-depth social transactions and exchanges that can provide greater opportunities for both positive and negative impacts to occur.

Demographics

In terms of age influencing residents' perceptions of impacts, it is suggested that younger residents tend to be more positive (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996), whilst older residents are often less positive about the impacts of tourism (Rothman, 1978; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Husbands, 1989). Gender is typically not found to play a role in influencing residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996), although Milman and Pizam (1988) did find that females tend to have more negative perceptions of tourism's impacts.

Regarding education, (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Hernandez, Cohen, & Garcia, 1996) have found that the more highly educated a person is, the more likely they are to have positive perceptions of impacts. Often related to higher levels of education are higher levels of income. Higher income earners or residents living in households with higher incomes more likely to perceive the impacts of tourism as positive (Pizam, 1978; Schroeder, 1992; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996).

Employment has been found to influence residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism. Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) found that more positive perceptions are held by residents who are employed. This need not be tourism-specific employment, but rather employment in general.

Length of Residence

Some studies have found that residents who have lived in an area for the shortest period of time have more positive perceptions of impacts (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996), whilst those residents who have lived in an area for longer periods tend to have more negative perceptions (Sheldon & Var, 1984; Allen, Long, Perdue, & Kieselbach, 1988; Schroeder, 1992; Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Ryan & Cooper, 2004). However, it has also been suggested that greater attachment to a community,

measured in terms of length of residence, is associated with both stronger positive and negative ratings (McCool & Martin, 1994).

Identification with the Theme

Studies of residents' perceptions of the impacts of events have found that those members of the resident population who identify with the event theme are those who are more likely to have positive perceptions of the impacts of the event (Cegielski & Mules, 2002; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002b).

Level of Participation

It has also been found that those residents who participate in an event are more likely to have positive perceptions of the event's impacts. Fredline and Faulkner (2002a) found that those who participated in a motorsports event, either by attending or watching the coverage on television, had the most positive perceptions of impacts. Similarly in another motorsports study, Cegielski and Mules (2002) found that residents who attended the event had more positive perceptions of its impacts.

2.4.2 Analytical Techniques

As discussed in the previous section, intrinsic studies are those recognising that a host community is not homogenous, and which investigate a range of variables that help explain an individual's perceptions of impacts. As an extension of examining each individual's perceptions of impacts, several studies go one step further and investigate whether social impacts are perceived differently by different subgroups within a community (Davis, Allen, & Cosenza, 1988; Ryan & Montgomery, 1994; Madrigal, 1995; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Williams & Lawson, 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a). Such studies are typically carried out by applying cluster analysis techniques, used to identify distinct groups who hold similar perceptions or share common sets of views which are distinguishable from the perceptions or views held by other identified groups (Kachigan, 1986; McDaniel & Gates, 2007). Cluster analysis studies segment a community into distinct groupings, explicitly recognising that respondents and their perceptions are not homogeneous. The value of such studies lies in the insight this provides for future planning and management, highlighting the need for consideration to be given not

only to the overall impacts on a community, but also to the differential impacts on subgroups within that community.

In both the wider tourism and events literatures, several studies have segmented a resident population based on their perceptions of impacts (Davis et al., 1988; Schroeder, 1992; Ryan & Montgomery, 1994; Madrigal, 1995; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Williams & Lawson, 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a; Ryan & Cooper, 2004). The clusters identified in these studies of residents' perceptions are listed in Table 1 below. The first column identifies the authors of each study. In the second column, the focus of the study is identified as either a tourism or event study. The third column lists the identified clusters for each study. These results suggest that three- and five-cluster solutions are most common, and that similarities exist in the types of cluster identified. In particular, for each study, a most positive and most negative resident cluster have been identified. The most positive cluster is referred to as the 'lovers', 'enthusiasts', 'supporters', 'pro-tourism' or 'most positive' cluster. These positive clusters exhibit strong positive perceptions and perceive very few negatives. They are also in support of future of future tourism development or the continued staging of an event. At the other extreme is the most negative cluster, referred to variably as the 'haters', 'somewhat irritated', 'cynics', 'opponents', 'against tourism' or 'most negative' cluster. These most negative clusters perceive very few positives, and hold strongly negative perceptions of impacts. These clusters tend to be against future development of tourism or the continuation of a specific event. An additional similarity between several of the studies is the identification of a neutral cluster, such as those labelled 'in-betweeners', 'middle-of-the-roaders', 'taxpayers' and 'ambivalent'. In a smaller number of studies, some additional clusters are also identified. Of interest is the 'realists' cluster identified by Schroeder (1992), Madrigal (1995) and Fredline and Faulkner (2000). The realists hold both strong positive and strong negative perceptions of impacts. This cluster is also economically connected to, and employed in the tourism industry or by an event, which is interesting, as they have a strong recognition of negative impacts.

Table 1: Identified Clusters in Previous Residents' Perceptions Studies

AUTHOR(S)	FOCUS OF STUDY	IDENTIFIED CLUSTERS
Davis, Allen and Cosenza (1988)	Tourism in Florida, USA.	Lovers; Love 'em for a reason; Cautious romantics; In-betweeners; Haters
Schroeder (1992)	Tourism in Flagstaff, Arizona, USA.	Lovers; Realists; Haters
Ryan and Montgomery (1994)	Tourism in Bakewell, UK.	Enthusiasts; Middle-of-the-roaders; Somewhat irritated
Madrigal (1995)	Tourism in Sedona, USA and York, UK.	Lovers; Realists; Haters
Fredline and Faulkner (2000)	The Gold Coast Indy, Queensland, Australia.	Lovers; Ambivalent supporters; Realists; Concerned for a reason; Haters
Weaver and Lawton (2001)	Tourism in Tamborine Mountain, Queensland, Australia.	Supporters; Neutrals; Opponents
Williams and Lawson (2001)	Tourism in ten New Zealand towns.	Lovers; Innocents; Taxpayers; Cynics
Fredline and Faulkner (2002a)	The Australian Formula One Grand Prix, Melbourne, and the Gold Coast Indy, Queensland, Australia.	Most positive; Moderately positive; Ambivalent; Moderately negative; Most negative
Ryan and Cooper (2004)	Tourism in Raglan, New Zealand.	Pro-tourism; Neither for nor against tourism; Against tourism

Whilst much of the previous research into segmenting a resident population has used residents' perceptions of impacts as a cluster base, more recent research uses other factors such as demographic and behavioural variables as a way to segment groups of residents (Inbakaran & Jackson, 2005a). A number of researchers support the use of demographic factors and behavioural characteristics as a clustering base, given the ease with which such segments are able to be identified and subsequently targeted (Mill & Morrison, 1998; Diaz-Martin, Iglesias, Vazquez, & Ruiz, 2000; Inbakaran & Jackson, 2005a; Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006). Even where studies do not use demographics as their initial clustering base, most studies still examine their

identified clusters on demographics, and undertake significance tests to determine the effect of demographic variables on differentiating between the clusters (Inbakaran & Jackson, 2005b).

Inbakaran and Jackson (2005a) undertook a study of residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism using a sample of residents from five tourist regions in Victoria, Australia. The study employs cluster analysis to identify key segments of the resident population, and uses a combination of demographics and behavioural variables as the clustering base. Demographic variables include gender, age, education, lifecycle stage, proximity, length of residence, and ethnicity. The behavioural variables include an occupational connection to tourism, voluntary connection to tourism and overall involvement in the tourism industry. Four clusters were identified based on these clustering variables and are labelled as ‘tourism industry connection’, ‘low tourism connection’, ‘neutral tourism development’ and ‘high tourism connection’. These clusters are then examined to see whether they differ in their perceptions of tourism impacts. Significant differences were found between the clusters on negative attitudes, with the low tourism connection cluster having the most negative attitudes and the high tourism connection cluster having the least negative attitudes (Inbakaran & Jackson, 2005a). Interestingly, the low tourism connection cluster was also found to have the most positive attitudes, rating the positive impacts highest.

The information gained through a cluster analysis enables those responsible for the planning and management of a festival to target specific actions to the identified needs of different community subgroups. As this is an important outcome of this research, demographic characteristics are seen to have practical value as part of the clustering base, given that clusters defined on demographics are relatively easy to identify and, therefore, are those towards whom targeted actions can be directed (Mill & Morrison, 1998; Inbakaran & Jackson, 2005b). Clusters that are defined on their perceptions of impacts are commonly profiled as a positive, negative or neutral cluster. This is not a profile from which these subgroups of the community can be easily identified. In comparison, by grouping clusters on demographics, the resultant clusters are profiled using more easily recognisable characteristics such as age and gender, allowing easier identification of these subgroups within the community.

This research will cluster residents on their demographic and behavioural characteristics in order to identify subgroups of the community who feel differently about a festival. These clusters will then be examined to see whether their perceptions of social impacts differ. In taking this approach, this research examines the usefulness of demographic and behavioural segmentation of the host community rather than segmentation based on perceptions of impacts, where much of the previous research in this field has been conducted to date (Davis et al., 1988; Ryan & Montgomery, 1994; Madrigal, 1995; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Williams & Lawson, 2001).

2.4.3 Event Impact Scale Development

Early research into the social impacts of events focused on an examination of residents' perceptions of these impacts. Extending beyond this, and based on recognition of the need for appropriate tools to measure residents' perceptions of event social impacts, there appeared a number of studies that focus on event impact scale development. Event impact scale development was an advancement of the work done previously in relation to tourism impact scale development. In particular, the tourism impact scales developed by Lankford and Howard (1994) and Ap and Crompton (1998) are recognised as the two main tools in this area. Occurring almost simultaneously in the events area, although each independently of the others, was a series of studies on event impact scale development conducted by Fredline (2000), Delamere (2001), Delamere et al. (2001), Fredline et al. (2003) and the author's own study (Small, 2002; Small & Edwards, 2003). These scales are incorporated into questionnaires that seek to measure residents' perceptions of social impacts of festivals and events. Refinement of these event impact scales using factor analysis has deepened the understanding of the social impacts of events.

Delamere et al. (2001) built upon existing tourism impact literature to develop a Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale (FSIAS). This scale was developed to measure and interpret resident perceptions of social impacts of community-based festivals. The study uses the Nominal Group Technique to generate a listing of items relating to the social impacts of community festivals, supplemented by impacts identified from a review of tourism impacts literature. The final list was reviewed using a modified Delphi process to "gain expert knowledge, opinion and consensus relating

to the content validity, clarity and readability of the item pool" (Delamere et al., 2001, p. 13). The researchers conducted a pretest of the FSIAS using a student sample. Factor analysis, using principal components with oblique rotation, identified two factors – social benefits and social costs of community festivals. Secondary factor analyses identified a number of sub-factors. For social benefits, the sub-factors are community benefits and cultural/education benefits. For social costs, the sub-factors are quality of life concerns and community resource concerns. The scale recognises the social impacts of small community festivals separately from the social impacts of general tourism development and, in doing so, provides greater value to festival researchers than generic tourism impact scales.

Delamere (2001) verified and refined the FSIAS by applying it to the Edmonton Folk Music Festival in Alberta, Canada. A questionnaire was administered to selected residents of the local population, who were asked to rate whether or not they thought the specified impacts would occur (expectancy) and, furthermore, what level of importance (value) they placed on such impacts. While the FSIAS provides insight into what impacts respondents expect will result from their festival and which of these are important to them, it does not explain the type of impact this will have on them. That is, will the impact be a positive or a negative? Will it have a very small impact or a very large impact? Factor analysis was used to refine the FSIAS and assess the underlying dimensionality of the scale items. As in the initial pretest, a principal components factor analysis using oblique rotation was performed, and this identified the two factors of social costs and social benefits. Secondary factor analysis in this case found that the first factor (social benefits) has two sub-factors of community benefits and individual benefits. The community benefits factor comprises items relating to community image, identity and wellbeing. The factor of individual benefits deals with experiencing new things and having opportunities to develop new skills and talents. The second factor (social costs) does not reveal any sub-factors. The broad terminology of 'social costs' is used to explain a range of variables related to overcrowding, traffic, litter, noise, and disruption and intrusion into the lives of local residents.

Based on earlier work by Fredline (2000), Fredline et al. (2003) developed an instrument for assessing the social impacts of a variety of medium- to large-scale

events. A case study approach was utilised, with three medium- to large-sized events held within Victoria, Australia, selected for the study. A mail questionnaire was distributed to local residents within each of the three communities in which these events took place. Respondents were asked to comment on whether they believe the item has changed as a result of the event, and to identify the direction of the change (increase, decrease, no change, or don't know). If they perceive a change, they were then asked to assess how it had affected both their personal quality of life and their community as a whole. Responses for both the personal and community ratings use a 7-point Likert scale ranging from –3 (very negative impact) to +3 (very positive impact). Whilst the Fredline et al. (2003) scale allows those respondents who agreed that an impact occurred to rate the level of the impact on a Likert scale, it does not provide the same opportunity for respondents to rate non-impact occurrence. That is, if a respondent perceives an impact not to have occurred, then that is all they get to convey. For example, a respondent who perceives no change in the level of community togetherness as a result of an event can report only this. They are not able to comment further on whether they perceive this to have had a positive or negative impact. The Fredline et al. (2003) scale, comprised of 45 impact statements, was subjected to factor analysis using principal components analysis and varimax rotation. The factor analysis identified six factors: social and economic development benefits, concerns about justice and inconvenience, impact on public facilities, impacts on behaviour and environment, long-term impacts on the community, and impacts on prices of some goods and services.

As an outcome of her Honours research, Small (2002) developed the Social Impact Perception (SIP) scale designed to measure residents' perceptions of the social impacts arising from small community festivals (Small & Edwards, 2003). The SIP scale was initially adapted from a scale used in a study by Green, Hunter and Moore (1990) in assessing the environmental impacts of tourism, which has since been reported elsewhere (Small, 2002; Small & Edwards, 2003; Small et al., 2005). A community festival held in the NSW Southern Highlands was chosen as the case study for testing the SIP scale. The SIP scale was piloted using the Delphi technique, which surveyed a small panel of expert members of the community on their perceptions of the social impacts resulting from the festival. A mail questionnaire was distributed to 32 stakeholders from the wider community including tourism,

government and business representatives. Respondents were asked to comment, in their opinion (either Yes, No or Don't Know), whether or not they believed the stated impacts to have occurred, and to indicate on the scale provided the level of impact they believe the item had. The level of impact was represented on a 5-part directional scale ranging from –5 (very large negative impact) to +5 (very large positive impact). "The study deemed it necessary to not only identify whether the impact had occurred but also belief and evaluative aspects of the perceived impacts" (Small & Edwards, 2003, p. 584). Knowing that residents agree that there was traffic congestion is not of great value to festival organisers. It is important for them to know what sort of impact this traffic congestion had on people, whether it was positive or negative, a very large or very small impact, which provides more valuable information for the future planning and management of the festival.

The SIP scale was able to provide this detailed information regarding respondents' perceptions of the occurrence and nature of the impacts that the festival had on them. However, because of the small scale of the pilot study, multivariate statistical analysis, such as factor analysis, was unable to be applied to the SIP scale. Therefore, while the SIP scale was originally developed as part of the author's Honours research (Small, 2002) additional research is required to further develop and extend the scale. The current research serves to develop and test the SIP scale more widely, using a residents' perceptions approach to understand the perceived social impacts of community festivals. Additionally, this larger sample size enables the use of factor analysis to identify the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals, and cluster analysis to identify distinct community subgroups that hold differing views of the festival.

2.5 Summary

This chapter has presented literature from two main areas relevant to the development of this thesis: tourism and sociology. From the sociological literature, the concept of community was discussed, highlighting its relevance in the study of community festivals which take place in a specific geographic location, typically hosted by and for members of a host community. Additionally, community

wellbeing and social capital were presented as two possible benefits for communities that may be enhanced through the hosting of a festival.

From the tourism literature, specifically focusing on the area of events, this chapter highlighted previous research on the social impacts of events, in particular, identifying the measurement of residents' perceptions as a common approach to examining social impacts. Cluster analysis was presented as a method of identifying distinct subgroups within a community, and a range of both extrinsic and intrinsic variables used in explaining residents' perceptions of impacts were presented. In addition, social exchange theory was presented as one approach used to explain the diversity in residents' perceptions of impacts. This chapter then discussed previous work in the development of tools for the measurement of residents' perceptions of the social impacts of events. As an area of research in which there has been relatively little work done so far, this discussion highlighted the need for further research in this area. The SIP scale was presented as a tool, which through further development may represent a useful tool for the measurement of residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.

In order to better understand the social impacts of festivals on communities, any further research should draw from relevant previous work in the field. It is the above outlined areas from both the tourism (events) and sociological literature that have been used to inform the research design and methodology for this study. Next, chapter 3 presents the research design used to answer the question, what are the social impacts of festivals on communities?

CHAPTER 3:

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the relevant literature that has played a role in the development of this thesis. Important concepts upon which the thesis is based, including the social impacts of events and the sociological literature on community, were discussed. In addition, chapter 2 discussed existing research on residents' perceptions and event impact scale development, which together provide the methodological basis for the thesis. This chapter presents the research design used in this study to answer the question, what are the social impacts of festivals on communities?

In order to answer this question, the following sub-aims were addressed:

1. to identify the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals;
2. to identify a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival;
3. to identify whether there are distinct subgroups within a community who differ in their feelings towards a festival;
4. to investigate whether these subgroups hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals;
5. to further develop the SIP scale as a tool for measuring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals;
6. to identify the implications of this research for the planning and management of future community festivals.

To achieve these aims, the research examined two Australian community festivals using a mixed methods approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. This chapter will first discuss the research methodology and paradigm underpinning this research, followed by a discussion on how the two

festivals were selected for the research, the methods used for data collection, the methods used in analysing the qualitative and quantitative data and, finally, the methodological limitations.

3.2 Research Methodology and Paradigm

In any research it is important to distinguish between the paradigm, methodology and methods used for data collection (Jennings, 2001). Whilst these are three separate areas, they are also interrelated, as the following discussion will show. At the upper level is the paradigm, which is the overarching belief system or set of worldviews that serves to guide researchers through all aspects of the research process (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). There are a great number of paradigms ranging from positivism through to interpretivism that can be adopted to underpin a piece of research. Positivism is "an approach to research based on the assumption that knowledge can be discovered by collecting data through observation and measurement and analysing it to establish truths" (Somekh & Lewin, 2005, p. 347). At the other end of the spectrum is the interpretive paradigm, which assumes that the social world is made up of multiple realities, and which recognises that reality is largely what people perceive it to be (Jennings, 2001; Neuman, 2006; Walliman, 2006). Essentially, "different paradigms provide particular sets of lenses for seeing the world and making sense of it in different ways" (Sparkes, 1992, p. 12).

The adoption of a particular paradigm should reflect the way the researcher views the topic and will help determine the choice of methodology (Jennings, 2001). The methodology is the "complementary set of guidelines for conducting research within the overlying paradigmatic view of the world" (Jennings, 2001, p. 34). Methodologies have traditionally been quantitative or qualitative, but more recently mixed method studies have become more widely used. Each of these methodologies has been commonly associated with one paradigm or another, although there is nothing to say that these connections are perfect, nor do they need to be followed to the letter (Bryman, 2004).

Below the levels of paradigm and methodology is the choice of the particular methods to be used in data collection. Research methodologies can be quantitative,

qualitative or mixed methods. Quantitative methodologies favour the collection of numerically based data from a large number of respondents, which can be statistically analysed, with the results able to be generalised to a wider population (Jennings, 2001). Qualitative methodologies generally gather more detailed and in-depth information in a non-numerical form from a smaller number of respondents (Veal, 2006). More recently there has been a growth in studies incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methods, often referred to as mixed methods. A mixed methods methodology is "the planned use of two or more different kinds of data gathering and analysis techniques" (Greene et al., 2005, p. 274). A similar definition provided by Mertens (2005) is that a mixed methods methodology "is one in which both quantitative and qualitative methods are used to answer research questions in a single study". The mixing of methods can be seen to stem from recognition that both quantitative and qualitative methods have particular strengths and weaknesses. A combination of the two methods allows for the strengths of each to be combined, and to have each method compensate for the other's weaknesses and limitations (Creswell, 2003; Brewer & Hunter, 2006). The concept of triangulation is also built into a mixed methods approach, in that the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods provides diverse perspectives through which a topic can be investigated (Greene et al., 2005).

A mixed methods methodology, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methods, was selected as the best approach to answer the question, what are the social impacts of festivals on communities? While a questionnaire was used to gather large amounts of primarily quantitative data from residents on their perceptions of the social impacts of a festival, qualitative methods were important in two different ways. First, qualitative methods including focus groups and semi-structured interviews were used to tailor the residents' perceptions questionnaire to the particular community being studied. The use of these qualitative methods allowed the researcher insight into the context of the study and allowed for the development of a questionnaire suited to the context. Second, qualitative methods were used to gather more rich, in-depth information that could be used to complement the quantitative data. The use of observation, for example, provides additional information that can help in interpreting the quantitative data gained through the questionnaire. Qualitative, open-ended questions also allow respondents

to provide additional information that can be useful in gaining a better understanding of the topic under study.

It was stated earlier that the choice of a particular paradigm should reflect the way a researcher views their topic and how they will see and make sense of the world. Traditionally, the positivist paradigm has been most commonly associated with quantitative methodologies, while the constructivist paradigm has been associated with qualitative methodologies (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Similarly, mixed methods have been associated with a particular paradigm, that of pragmatism (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Patton, 2002; Greene et al., 2005).

Pragmatism is an alternative paradigm put forward by researchers who support the use of mixing qualitative and quantitative methods within a single study. As Cherryholmes (1992, p. 13) notes, "there are many versions of pragmatism, with different points of emphasis, interpretations, and reinterpretations". Originally developed by Charles Pierce and William James, early explanations of pragmatism stressed that the meaning and truth of an idea or proposition lie in its observable practical consequences (Cherryholmes, 1992; Wicks & Freeman, 1998). In relation to a specific research problem, pragmatists would argue that while there exist multiple interpretations, frameworks or possible categorisation schemes, the one that is 'true' is the one that is the most useful and practical in relation to the identified research problem (Wicks & Freeman, 1998; Marshall, Kelder, & Perry, 2005; Recker, 2006). That is, pragmatists adopt usefulness and practical relevance as the criteria against which research findings are to be judged.

In more recent years, what has been highlighted as being key to a pragmatic approach is that it encourages the selection of the best range of methods, both qualitative and quantitative, that will help to answer the research question at hand (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Patton, 2002; Creswell, 2003). The value of pragmatism lies in its embrace of 'what works' and in allowing a researcher the freedom to choose the best mix of methods to answer the research question (Creswell, 2003). A pragmatic approach also sees research taking place in context, whether that be a specific social, political or historical context (Cherryholmes, 1992; Creswell, 2003; Marshall et al., 2005). Pragmatism, therefore, seemed appropriate

for this thesis in that it allowed for and supported the use of a range of quantitative and qualitative methods that best answered the research question on the social impacts of festivals on communities, and also put a focus on the practical consequences and usefulness of the research findings. The explicit recognition that any research takes place within a particular social context was also important, given the contextually based nature of the research, concerned with the social impacts of festivals on two small communities. This thesis is therefore located within a pragmatic paradigm, which is that most commonly used to justify the use of mixed method approaches to research.

3.3 Selection of Festivals

This research sought to understand the social impacts that festivals have on their communities, and did so by examining two Australian community festivals: Hadley Music Festival in Hadley, Western Australia, and Rockford Music Festival in Rockford, Victoria.

It was important that the festivals be comparable since it was the aim of this study to aggregate the responses in order to conduct data analysis. Therefore, a set of criteria was established for the selection of the festivals, which considered the size of the town and local population; the number of visitors to the festival; the number of years the festival had been running; the links the festival had with the community, illustrated by its theme and organisation; the duration of the festival; and the time of year in which the festival was held.

The researcher considered the size of the town and local population in relation to the number of visitors attending the festival. The doubling or tripling of a local population overnight with an influx of festival visitors represents significant potential for a range of social impacts on the host community.

The number of years the festival had been running was considered as an indication of how well established the festival was in the community, and also how much experience residents had with the festival taking place in their community. This was thought to affect residents' expectations and perceptions of social impacts, given

their potential for previous experience and/or exposure to the festival and its range of social impacts.

In selecting a festival, the researcher searched for one that had links with its local community, as illustrated through both its theme and organisation. In terms of its theme, the researcher looked for a festival that had a theme originating from within the community, rather than from a source external to the town. This was important since festivals which evolve from within the community can be considered as a demonstration of that community's "values, interests, and aspirations" (Derrett, 2003, p. 50), often developed with the purpose of trying to build community relationships and wellbeing. Also important was the degree to which the local population was involved in the planning and staging of the festival, as this is representative of an authentic community-based festival (Getz, 1991). Therefore the researcher targeted those festivals which had a predominantly local volunteer organising committee.

The duration of the festival was considered for its role in influencing the range and level of social impacts that might affect the host community. The festival needed to be of sufficient length to allow the potential for social impacts to be generated, but still short enough so that the impacts were relatively contained and measurable. The time of year in which the festival was held was a practical consideration. Thus, the selection took into account which festivals would best fit into the researcher's overall timeline for the research.

Initially, seven festivals were considered as possibilities for the research and were examined in relation to how well they met the criteria discussed above. Please note that while the two states have been accurately identified, in order to comply with a request from the festivals to remain anonymous the researcher has adopted a pseudonym for each community and its festival: the Hadley Music Festival in Western Australia and the Rockford Music Festival in Victoria. These two festivals were selected as they exhibited the best mix of the desired characteristics, and because the committees consented to being involved in the research. Hadley Music Festival and Rockford Music Festival are comparable in terms of their theme (music), the size of the local population and number of visitors to the festival, and

that both are relatively well established festivals within their community, each running for over 10 years (see table 2).

Table 2: Festival Profiles

	FESTIVALS	
CHARACTERISTICS	**Hadley Music Festival**	**Rockford Music Festival**
Local population	Approx. 4,000	Approx. 3,000
Visitor numbers	Approx. 16,000	Approx. 10-12,000
Number of years running	14th year 2006	10th year 2006
Theme	Music	Music
Duration	3 days	3 days
Timing	Held annually in November.	Held annually in November.

Following the selection of the two festivals, a range of methods was used in collecting the necessary data to answer the research questions. The following section provides a discussion of each of these methods used in the research.

3.4 Methods of Data Collection

This research examined the social impacts of community festivals using two Australian community-based festivals: the Hadley Music Festival in Western Australia and the Rockford Music Festival in Victoria. The research used a mixed methods approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. In order to identify the social impacts these festivals had on their host communities, the following methods were used:

- semi-structured interviews
- residents' perceptions questionnaire
- focus groups
- observation
- document analysis.

Each of these methods will now be discussed in turn.

3.4.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were carried out with key stakeholders involved in the organisation and management of each of the two festivals. Semi-structured interviews are guided by a pre-prepared list of questions or topics to be examined, with flexibility available to the interviewer in the wording and ordering of questions (Merriam, 1988). A semi-structured interview guide was developed to focus the interview questions on organisational aspects, community participation and the social impacts of the festival. This information proved to be quite valuable in describing the festivals, profiling the communities and identifying potential social impacts resulting from community festivals.

Interview Participants

Interview participants were selected using a 'purposive sampling' technique, in which the researcher's judgement is used to purposefully select a sample that will provide the necessary information being sought (Mertens, 2005). That is, purposive sampling selects 'information-rich' respondents who have the specific knowledge the researcher is looking for. Interview participants were selected based on their position as a key member of the festival organising committee or other significant festival stakeholder. This information was available publicly, via each of the festivals' websites. The key contact person for each festival also assisted the researcher in identifying potential interviewees. Other factors that were taken into consideration in selecting interview participants included the willingness of people to participate in an interview and the time they had available for an interview during the period in which the researcher was visiting the community.

Eight semi-structured interviews were undertaken in each community. Interviews were conducted with six members of the Hadley Music Festival organising committee, with one local council representative and with one member of the first organising committee who established the festival twelve years ago and who remains somewhat involved with the festival. In Rockford, the researcher interviewed the chair of the Rockford Music Festival board, two board members, the business manager and the artistic director. In addition, the researcher conducted interviews with three volunteer team leaders.

Interview Procedure

The researcher visited each of the communities for a one-week period, during which time all of the interviews were conducted. In Hadley, the interview schedule was not pre-arranged, although selected interview participants had been asked to make themselves available for interviews during this week. This was the extent of the arrangement, and it was on arrival in Hadley that the researcher went about scheduling interviews with the selected participants.

In Rockford, the approach to organising the interviews was quite different. The researcher's primary contact person at the festival thought it would be better that participants were contacted by the festival organisers, rather than the researcher making contact herself. So once the researcher had identified those people with whom she wanted to conduct interviews, the administrative assistant went about scheduling the interviews. On arrival in Rockford, the researcher was provided with an interview schedule for the week.

Prior to the day of the interview, participants were provided with an information sheet outlining the purpose of the interview, the types of questions that would be asked and why they were selected to participate (see appendix 1). The permission of each participant was sought for the tape recording of the interview, and the process for assuring their anonymity was explained. After reading the information sheet, participants were invited to take part in the interview, and to indicate their agreement by signing a consent form, which was collected by the interviewer. All those invited to participate agreed to take part in an interview and signed the consent form.

A semi-structured interview guide was developed to focus the interview questions on organisational aspects, community participation and social impacts of the festival. Using an interview guide also helps to ensure consistency across interviews by making sure that the same general questions or issues are discussed in each interview (Patton, 2002). This guide served to focus the content of the interview. However, it didn't restrict the interviewer from adding, deleting or modifying questions as required during the course of the interview. The same interview guide was therefore able to be used for all interviews in both communities, given that follow-up questions

and points of clarification could be made as necessary during each interview. Some flexibility was also allowed so that, for example, some people answered two questions in one, or questions were asked in a different order to aid the flow of the interview.

Each interview lasted for approximately one hour. They were conducted in various locations within each community, but as a general rule, the setting was quite informal. In Hadley, interviews were conducted in the festival office, in a local café (whilst closed) and in the homes of interviewees. In Rockford, interviews took place in the sitting room of a local hotel; in its private courtyard and restaurant (whilst closed).

3.4.2 Residents' Perceptions Questionnaire

A self-administered questionnaire (see appendix 2) was mailed to local residents within each of the two communities being studied. The purpose of the questionnaire was to gather residents' perceptions on a range of social impacts that may result from the hosting of their festival. The researcher used a mail questionnaire as it represented the most cost-effective way of reaching the greatest number of local residents. A cross-sectional design was implemented, which gathered data from residents at one point in time following the staging of the festival. Detailed aspects of the questionnaire design, population and sampling methods, questionnaire administration and response rates are presented in the following sections.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire used in this research consists of five sections seeking both qualitative and quantitative responses designed to measure residents' perceptions of the social impacts arising from community festivals. The questionnaire was constructed from components of several instruments. The Social Impact Perception (SIP) scale that features in section B of the questionnaire was developed in a previous study by the researcher (Small & Edwards, 2003). The other sections of the questionnaire were drawn from research in the field of event impact studies, in

particular from work by Fredline (2000) and also previous research by the author (Small & Edwards, 2003).

Section A asked a series of open-ended questions, adapted from Fredline's work (2000), which sought to find out residents' initial expectations and general perceptions regarding the social impacts of their festival. Question 1 asked respondents for the first word that came into their mind when thinking of the festival. Questions 2, 3 and 4, whilst adapted from Fredline's work (2000), were tailored to suit the specific purposes of this study. Whilst Fredline's (2000) research asked only for residents' perceptions of the social impacts of the festival, this research sought to understand residents' pre-festival expectations as well as their perceptions of social impacts. By including a series of questions accessing residents' pre-festival expectations of social impacts, this research will provide insights into the range of social impacts, both positive and negative, that residents expected to occur as a result of their festival and, moreover, whether an overall positive or negative expectation exists for members of the host community. To achieve this purpose, an additional part (part a) was added to questions 2, 3 and 4 which asked for residents' expectations of social impacts. Question 2a asked respondents how they *expected* the staging of the festival to affect their life. Question 2b then asked if they *perceived* their life to have been affected in this way. Question 3a asked respondents what they *expected* the positive social impacts of the festival to be, and question 3b asked if they *perceived* these positive social impacts to have occurred. Question 4a asked respondents what they *expected* the negative social impacts of the festival to be, and question 4b asked if they *perceived* these negative social impacts to have occurred.

Section B asked respondents to give their opinions on 41 social impact statements using the SIP scale. The SIP scale includes a two-part response for each impact item. For part one, respondents were instructed to answer by giving their opinion (either 'Yes', 'No' or 'Don't Know') in relation to the occurrence of a stated impact. For part two of the response, those who answered 'yes' or 'no' were asked to indicate on the scale provided the level of impact they believe the item had. Those who answered 'don't know' were instructed to move on to the next question, skipping part two of the response. Provided in the questionnaire was a five-part directional

scale ranging from –5 (negative five) to +5 (positive five), with zero as the midpoint representing "no impact", 1 representing a "very small impact", 2 representing a "small impact", 3 representing a "moderate impact", 4 representing a "large impact", and 5 representing a "very large impact". Values on the negative side of the scale represent varying levels of negative impacts, while values on the positive side represent varying levels of positive impacts. The inclusion of a –5 to +5 scale helps to better separate the data and facilitate observations of patterns within the negative and positive rankings and enables the data to undergo higher order analysis (Garson, 2004b). An example of the SIP scale is provided in table 3 below.

Previous research by the author suggested that the SIP scale should provide respondents with the opportunity to rate the non-occurrence of an impact. That is, even when impacts were perceived not to have occurred, respondents were asked to rate the nature and level of the impact. This recognises that it is not only the impacts that residents perceive to have occurred but also those they perceive *not* to have occurred that can have a positive or negative effect in itself (Small, 2002; Small & Edwards, 2003).

Table 3: Social Impact Perception (SIP) Scale with Example Question

IMPACT STATEMENT	**IMPACT**			**LEVEL OF IMPACT**										
The footpaths and streets were crowded during the festival	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5

The listing of impact statements which form the SIP scale were drawn from a review of the existing literature on the social impacts of tourism, and festivals and events more specifically. In particular, the work of Fredline (2000) and Delamere et al. (2001) provided many of the impact items. Some of these items were reworded to suit the current study, with the major consideration for inclusion being whether an impact was relevant and likely to occur as a result of a small community festival.

Section C sought respondents' views on a range of factors that are thought to affect residents' perceptions of impacts, such as their level of involvement in tourism, their level of place attachment and level of identification with the theme of the festival.

These ‘clustering variables’ are used to group together similar members of the community based on these characteristics. The questions designed to access this information were adapted from Fredline (2000), with several changes made to the questions to make them more relevant to the particular context of the researcher’s own study.

Questions 1 to 6 in Section C asked respondents to comment on a series of statements designed to measure their level of place attachment, perceptions of public participation in the festival and perceptions of the distribution of social impacts within the community, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”. Questions 7 to 11 measured the respondents’ level of identification with the theme of the festival, asking them a series of questions about their attendance at the festival, their level of interest in and support for the festival, and about their overall feelings or attitude towards the festival. Questions 12 to 18 asked respondents to provide either a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response to a series of statements designed to measure their levels of past and current involvement in tourism, their past and current involvement in the festival, and their economic dependence on the festival.

Section D asked for basic demographic and background information about the respondents. Typical demographics such as age, gender, country of residence, length of residence in region, education, employment, occupation and income were sought. This information was used, in addition to the responses gained in Section C, to group similar respondents together in order to create ‘clusters’.

Section E consisted of one lined page which allowed respondents to make any additional comments about the festival and its perceived social impacts on the host community.

The questionnaire was piloted using focus groups, discussed in section 3.4.3.

Questionnaire Population and Sample

In each community, the population of interest was the local resident population. For this research, residential households were targeted as a way of accessing individual

residents. The population for study was identified using the local government area (LGA) classifications. Figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics provide both population and household numbers based on the LGA classifications.

As at June 2004, Hadley had an estimated resident population of 3,972 persons (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2004). An earlier estimate of household numbers for Hadley showed a total of 1,545 households (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002a). The chosen sampling frame for research within this community was a local community phonebook. It was learnt through discussions with the festival organisers and other locals that being a country town, residential addresses often differed from mailing addresses. It was therefore decided not to use the White Pages phone directory as initially planned, since surveys would be sent to mostly residential addresses. The local community phonebook, prepared by the community itself and containing a greater proportion of mailing addresses rather than residential addresses, was selected to ensure that surveys reached the desired residents. A total of 1,509 residential household listings were found in the community phonebook.

In Rockford, as at June 2004, the resident population was estimated to be 3,212 persons (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2004). Within this community, figures show an estimated 1,292 households (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002b). The chosen sampling frame for research within this community was the local permanent ratepayers' list. After visiting Rockford and talking with local residents and those involved with the festival, some of the intricacies of this town were revealed that would make sampling difficult. In particular, there was a high proportion of non-permanent residents and holiday-home owners within the area. These holiday-home owners live elsewhere and therefore their household is left vacant for large parts of the year. The concern was that by using the White Pages phone directory as the sampling frame, as was initially planned, surveys would be sent to households in which no one was residing, therefore affecting the response rates and also representing a waste of research funds. Instead, a permanent ratepayers' list for the area was provided by local council. This allowed the research to more effectively target households in which residents were living, thus helping to ensure a higher response rate. A total of 1,098 residential household listings were found on the ratepayers' list.

The researcher, seeking the highest response rate achievable, decided to select all residential listings from each sampling frame in each community. The researcher was concerned that, given the small numbers in each community, a sufficient response would not be gained. It was decided to send surveys to every household listed in an attempt to ensure sufficient responses for the use of statistical procedures, including factor analysis and cluster analysis. Therefore 1,509 and 1,098 survey packets were distributed to Hadley and Rockford respectively. The sampling methods used in this research are summarised below in table 4.

Table 4: Summary of Sampling Methods

	FESTIVAL COMMUNITIES	
SAMPLING METHODS	**Hadley**	**Rockford**
Sampling unit	Local resident population	Local resident population
Sampling frame	Local community phonebook	Local ratepayers list
Sampling method	Every residential listing	Every residential listing
Sample size	1,509 households	1,098 households
Administration method	Mail survey	Mail survey

The following section details the administration of the residents' perceptions questionnaire in each community and reports on the response rates achieved.

Questionnaire Administration and Response

Within each survey packet there were two copies of the questionnaire, two reply-paid envelopes and a cover letter. The cover letter explained to residents the purpose of the study being conducted and the role they, as respondents, would play in the study (see appendix 3). Two questionnaires were provided to allow for more than one person within each household to respond, where applicable. This measure was taken because of the relatively small numbers of people living in each of these two communities, in an effort to increase the response rate. The cover letter made residents aware of how important each individual response would be to the accuracy

of the research. It was made clear that the return of a completed survey was taken as consent to participate in the study. Reply-paid envelopes were included to ensure a higher return rate.

The survey packets were sent to residents in each community approximately two weeks following the staging of each festival. From a total of 3,018 questionnaires (1,509 survey packets) sent out in Hadley, and 2,196 questionnaires (1,098 survey packets) sent out in Rockford, 257 and 287 useable responses were received respectively. These figures represent response rates of approximately 8.5% in Hadley and 13% in Rockford. The total number of useable responses gained was 544.

3.4.3 Focus Groups – Questionnaire Pretest Method

Pretesting refers to "a trial run with a group of respondents to iron out fundamental problems in the survey design" (Zikmund, 2000, p. 273). Focus groups are useful in pretesting by allowing for "group discussion of the proposed items in crucial sections of the questionnaire" (Morgan, 1988, p. 34). Pretesting a questionnaire within focus groups allows the researcher to assess participants' understanding of the questions. Not only can such problems be identified within a focus group situation, but the ability to immediately explore the problem with respondents and look for solutions is available (Morgan, 1988). Focus groups were therefore selected as an effective way of pretesting the residents' perceptions questionnaire.

Pretesting enables the researcher to determine whether categories, items and questions are valid and reliable. Essentially, pretesting is conducted to determine how well a questionnaire works (Hunt, Sparkman, & Wilcox, 1982). According to Aaker, Kumar and Day (2004), there are two categories of items to be pretested. The first category consists of items pertaining to the questionnaire itself, including questionnaire length, layout, format and readability, are tested. Second, individual questions should be tested, checking for loaded, ambiguous, or double-barrelled questions, missing response options, relevance and unintentional biases. Following guidelines by Aaker et al. (2004), the pretest in this research focused on testing for respondent interest and attention; whether the flow of the questionnaire was clear and

logical; that the length of the questionnaire was suitable; that instructions were understandable; that response formats didn't have too high a degree of difficulty; that the formatting and layout of the questionnaire was appealing; and that the wording of questions and their intent were clear.

An added benefit of using focus groups was that they allowed for the instrument to be tailored to each community being studied. As the questionnaire was developed through a literature review and a previous study (Small & Edwards, 2003), there was a chance that some items would not be relevant for these two communities. It was therefore important to test for content validity of questionnaire items. Respondents in the pretest were instructed to consider whether the items comprising the questionnaire were relevant to their festival and community.

Focus Group Participants and Sample Size

According to Aaker et al. (2004), pretest participants should be representative of the target population to whom the final questionnaire will be distributed. In this research, as local residents within each of the festival communities were the target population, it was necessary for pretest participants to come from these local communities. Whilst it is important that pretest participants are representative of the wider community that will eventually receive the questionnaire, it was also critical to this study that pretest participants were able to comment on whether the items outlined in the questionnaire were relevant to their festival and community. Therefore it was necessary for pretest participants to have knowledge of the festival in order to allow them to do this. Since many local residents and stakeholders from the community also participate in the festival as volunteers, these community volunteers represented an ideal source of focus group participants. In this way, it would ensure that the content of the questionnaire was relevant to the festival and the community being studied.

Although focus group participants were selected from a limited source, in this case the volunteer database, any resultant bias is only a problem if the researcher is unaware of it. That is, bias can only become a problem if the researcher considers the discussion raised by the limited sample of focus group participants as being representative of the wider population when in fact, it is not (Morgan, 1988). To

ensure that this did not pose a problem, the researcher considered the source of her focus group participants and the potential biases that the position of the festival volunteer might introduce before inviting them to participate. The researcher concluded that the participants were reasonably representative of the community in which each festival was held, and were therefore suitable as focus group participants.

Typically, focus groups have between six and twelve participants (Goodrick & Emmerson, 2004). Researchers will often over-recruit participants for a focus group due to the difficulties of ensuring that all participants will turn up on the day (Morgan, 1988). Therefore, it was decided to aim for a group size of up to twelve participants. The organising committee of each festival was responsible for the recruitment of ten to twelve participants for each of two focus groups to be conducted in their community. Potential participants were selected at random by the organisers from their volunteer database. It was hoped that recruiting up to twelve participants per focus group would ensure that sufficient numbers showed up on the day. Additionally, having the organisers responsible for recruitment allowed the researcher to avoid any breach of privacy laws that would result from personal details of volunteers being provided to a third party.

Four focus groups were held: one afternoon and one evening focus group in each community. In Hadley, there were ten confirmed participants for each of the two focus groups. On the day, eight and nine participants turned up to the afternoon and evening sessions respectively. In Rockford, there were eight and nine confirmed participants for the two focus groups. Both the afternoon and evening sessions ran with six participants each.

Focus Group Procedure

A neutral location was used to hold the focus groups. In Hadley they were held in the conference room of the local tourism bureau, and in Rockford, they were held in the meeting room of a local hotel. The focus groups were conducted using a round table layout, and light refreshments were provided. Each focus group session ran for between one and a half and two hours. The researcher conducted the focus groups.

Prior to the focus groups, participants were provided with an information sheet outlining the purpose of the focus group and why they were selected to participate (see appendix 4). The focus groups began with a welcome and introduction from the researcher, who provided an overview of the research project and explained the format in which the focus group would run. Following this, the permission of each participant was sought for the tape recording of the focus group, and participants were invited to indicate their agreement to participate by signing a consent form. All those invited to participate agreed to take part in the focus group and signed the consent form, which were collected by the researcher before the focus groups were officially underway.

Aaker et al. (2004) discuss two methods for conducting an interview pretest: the debriefing approach or the protocol approach. The protocol approach suggests that respondents should 'think aloud' as they complete the questionnaire (Aaker et al., 2004, p. 329). The debriefing approach advises that the researcher should administer the questionnaire to respondents using the same methods that are to be used in the final study (Aaker et al., 2004). It was decided that the focus groups be undertaken using the debriefing approach for two reasons. First, because there would be a number of participants in each focus group, asking them to think out loud could result in a confusing and distracting atmosphere. Second, the final instrument would be a self-complete questionnaire mailed to respondents for completion on their own. Therefore, it was determined that it would be more beneficial to ask participants to complete the questionnaire in a way that was similar to that which was intended for the full-scale study.

Conducting the debriefing approach within the focus groups involved a number of stages. First, participants were provided with a copy of the social impact questionnaire, clearly labelled as a "draft only". Second, they were specifically instructed not to ask the moderator for help but instead to make a note where they felt confusion or difficulty with a question. Third, the moderator observed the participants as they completed the questionnaire and noted behaviour that indicated confusion, difficulty or uneasiness with the questionnaire. The moderator looked for facial expressions that might represent confusion and also body language including people leaning back into their chairs, 'stopping to think', scratching their heads or

other body language that may have indicated that participants had an issue with some aspect of the questionnaire. Fourth, participants were timed in order to make note of the maximum and minimum amount of time it took to complete the questionnaire. Finally, participants were 'debriefed' following the completion of all questionnaires. The debrief included questions regarding the length and format of the questionnaire, difficulties understanding question wording or how to respond, and clarity of instructions.

The flexibility of focus groups implies that "the set of topics covered may change after each focus group experience" (Aaker et al., 2004, p. 200). If a question is failing to generate useful information, it may be dropped from subsequent focus groups. Additionally, should a new idea emerge from early focus groups, it may be added as an item for discussion in the focus groups that follow. This allows for the development of ideas, concepts and impacts that are specific to respondents, rather than predefined variables. Changes to wording were made after the first group so that the moderator could test for clarity in the subsequent focus groups. However, because it was important for each group to be tested on the original impact items, changes to impact items were not made until the completion of all focus groups in both communities. Following the first focus group in Hadley, the moderator kept a list of the impact items that participants wanted deleted or added and raised them for discussion if they had not already been identified by the subsequent focus groups. This was important given that focus groups were being held in different communities, and assumptions should not be made about potential responses in later focus groups in a different community. Therefore, before any items that did not hold meaning for participants were modified or deleted from the questionnaire, they were discussed in all focus groups to ensure there was consensus on the change.

According to Aaker et al (2004) when using focus groups as a pretest tool, "three to four group sessions are usually sufficient". Whilst the first session produces the most information, in subsequent sessions it is often the case that much of what is raised for discussion has been covered before, with little benefit to be gained from running additional focus groups (Aaker et al., 2004). In this research, consistent with the findings of Aaker et al. (2004), following the first two focus groups, much of what was said in later focus groups had been heard before.

Focus Group Outcomes

The comments from participants in the focus groups were used to refine the residents' perceptions questionnaire. The focus groups revealed a number of issues that required changes to each of the five sections of the questionnaire. Section A required only one change, which was the addition of a definition of social impacts. Section B initially contained 34 social impact statements, and it was this section that underwent the most changes. Given that this initial listing of impact items was developed through a review of existing literature and previous research by the author (Small & Edwards, 2003), the comments from the focus group participants were important in refining this section of the questionnaire. Of the 34 impact statements, six were significantly reworded and eight were deleted. Impacts that were deleted were those deemed unsuitable and irrelevant for a community festival such as the Hadley Music Festival or the Rockford Music Festival. Not only did the focus groups allow for the revision and clarification of existing items in this section, they also resulted in 15 additional impact statements being added. These changes are illustrated in appendices 5, 6 and 7, which show the items that were reworded, items that were deleted and new items added into the final questionnaire, respectively.

Section C included cluster variables, and section D was made up of variables relating to demographic information. Both these sections were altered after the focus groups. The wording of several questions was modified in order to avoid ambiguity, and at the request of focus group participants, extra response options were added. The order of these two sections was also rearranged to improve the flow of questions. Section E contained space in which respondents could make any final comments. On request, the number of lines left for comments was increased from nine to eighteen. The final questionnaire can be found in appendix 2.

3.4.4 Observation

Qualitative observation occurs in naturalistic settings and thus seeks to observe people's naturally occurring behaviours (Adler & Adler, 1998). At each of the two festivals, the researcher conducted observations with the purpose of seeing firsthand what took place at each festival. The observations made by the researcher were

beneficial in describing each of the festivals and profiling the communities in which they were held.

Observation was unstructured, meaning that it was free from restrictions regarding what the observer could note. Qualitative observers are not bound by "predetermined categories of measurement or response but are free to search for concepts or categories that appear meaningful to subjects" (Adler & Adler, 1998, p. 81). The researcher was therefore free to note anything thought to be interesting or relevant to the research at hand. Observations could include any aspect of "participants, interactions, routines, rituals, temporal elements, interpretations, and social organisation" (Adler & Adler, 1998, p. 86).

Observations were recorded in the form of field notes, written either as they were taking place or shortly after being observed. Field notes were written in view of those people being observed: however, it is unlikely that this task would have drawn attention; thus it was unobtrusive observation. The researcher observed on countless occasions visitors to the festival taking to their programs with a pen, presumably to map out those activities they planned to attend. Combined with all the entertainment provided by the festival, it is likely that the researcher appeared to be simply another visitor to the festival.

The researcher could be classified as acting between the roles of known and unknown observer (Adler & Adler, 1998). To some members of these communities, the researcher was known. This was unavoidable to some extent, since the researcher had to establish relationships, primarily with the festival organising committees, in order to gain access to conduct the research. In addition, the researcher was known to selected volunteers, particularly those who had taken part in the focus groups, as well as members of local council with whom she had made contact. There was, however, a large segment of these communities to whom the researcher remained unknown. This allowed the researcher to conduct observations throughout the festival without too many people being aware of her role. The known/unknown observer is similar to what Bryman (2004) refers to as the overt/covert observer. Whilst a researcher may need to take on an overt role to gain

initial access to a research setting, once inside they may be able to take on a covert role with other individuals in that setting (Bryman, 2004).

The researcher conducted unstructured observation, recording notes as observations were made, with the analysis to be conducted at a later time. Observations gained firsthand at the festival reflected the actuality of the festival, rather than the planned version as envisaged by the organising committee. In many cases, what stands in theory is often not what occurs in reality. Similarly, what people say is often quite different to what they do (Gillham, 2000). Observation provided the researcher with firsthand information that could be used in aiding the analysis of data collected through other sources, such as organisational documents and interviews with members of the organising committee. Personal observations by the researcher also proved extremely valuable when it came to analysing the responses to the questionnaire. Having experienced and observed the festival helped in interpreting respondents' comments since the researcher was familiar with what took place on the weekend.

3.4.5 Document Analysis

Documents that were most useful were those provided by the organising committees with regard to their organisational structure, history of the festival and results of previous research, as well as various promotional materials on each festival. The researcher also made use of publicly accessible information, available through the World Wide Web. This included information gained from the Hadley Music Festival and Rockford Music Festival websites and population profiles for each community from the Australian Bureau of Statistics website.

The purpose of analysing records and documents is to provide a more in-depth analysis of the topic under study (Hodder, 1998). Analysis of this range of documents was used to aid the researcher's understanding of the research context. The document analysis provided the necessary information to describe each of the two festivals and to create a profile of the communities in which they were held.

Similar to the ways in which observation was used to gain insights into the actuality of the festival, rather than any planned or ideal version, document analysis was used to compare information gained through other data collection sources to what is documented in existing materials. Documents can provide a "formal framework to which you may have to relate the informal reality" (Gillham, 2000, p. 21). For example, analysis of various organisational documents was used to cross-reference information gained through the semi-structured interviews with the festival organisers.

3.5 Methods of Data Analysis

Implementation of the range of methods discussed previously allowed for the collection of data necessary to answer the question, 'what are the social impacts of festivals on communities?'. The variety of data gathered for the purpose of this research meant that a number of different qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods were employed. The following sections will now outline the quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods used.

3.5.1 Quantitative Data Analysis Methods

Quantitative data from the residents' perceptions questionnaires were entered into Excel and analysed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). A range of descriptive statistics was calculated, and then factor analysis and cluster analysis were applied to the data.

Descriptive Statistics

"Descriptive research usually involves the presentation of information in a fairly simple form" (Veal, 2006, p. 306). Two of the most common forms of descriptive statistics are frequencies and means. Frequencies provide simple counts and percentages for a range of quantitative variables, and means represent an average value, useful only for numerical or scale variables (Veal, 2006). Frequencies were used to explore and describe both the clustering variables from Section C, as well as the demographic data in Section D of the questionnaire. Frequencies also allowed calculation of the percentage of respondents in each response category ('Yes', 'No'

and ‘Don’t Know’) regarding the occurrence of the social impacts in Section B of the questionnaire. The mean level of impact assigned by each of these respondent groups was then calculated, ranging from -5 to +5, representative of a level of impact corresponding with the SIP scale.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a statistical procedure used to identify the “underlying constructs that summarise a set of variables” (Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986, p. 296). Factor analysis is a useful tool for researchers wanting to understand a large amount of data, as it reduces a large number of variables to a “smaller, more manageable, and interpretable number of factors” (Kachigan, 1986, p. 379). In order to gain a deeper understanding of the perceived social impacts of community festivals, factor analysis using SPSS 12.0 was applied to the 41-item SIP scale.

Factor analysis comprised five main steps discussed below under the subheadings of data recoding, data screening, factor extraction, deciding on the number of factors to retain and factor rotation.

Data Recoding

The data gathered from the two festivals was aggregated in order to allow factor analysis to be conducted on the overall set of responses. The responses, however, were not in a format suitable to be factor analysed. The SIP scale had a two-part response for each impact item: part one was a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response in relation to the occurrence of an impact, and part two was a value ranging between –5 (negative five) and +5 (positive five) representing the level of impact. In order to run the factor analysis, the data from the SIP scale needed to be recoded. First, the -5 to +5 scale was recoded. This was recoded from 1 to 11 (as shown in table 5), which removed any problems associated with having negative values in the data file. The values represented by the scale remain unchanged, with 1 representing a very large negative impact, 6 representing the midpoint of no impact, and 11 representing a very large positive impact. For example, an impact rated as a +4 would be recoded into a 10, which still conveys the original rating of a large positive impact.

Table 5: Scale Recoding

	LEVEL OF IMPACT										
Original Coding	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
Recoding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11

Second, there were still issues of complexity stemming from having responses in both 'yes' and 'no' format, as related to the occurrence of an impact. It was decided that recoding would be used to put all the responses into the same format. This was achieved by reversing all 'no' responses into a 'yes' response, which also involved reversing the associated impact ratings. Subsequently all responses were in the form of a 'yes' response whilst enabling the data to retain its original meanings. For example, a respondent who answered NO to there being traffic congestion, with an impact rating of +4 is essentially saying that not experiencing traffic congestion is a positive impact. To reverse this statement, the NO response is converted to a YES, and the +4 is reversed to a -4 (which equates to a 2 in the recoded scale shown above). In this recoded form, this statement implies that traffic congestion is a negative impact. This is essentially the same meaning as implied in the original statement, however in reverse. It still conveys the perception that not having traffic congestion is a positive impact.

Data Screening

Data screening and the resolution of any issues within the data set are highly recommended, and are recognised as being "fundamental to an honest analysis of the data" (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p. 57). Data screening involved the deletion of 'problem cases', which were defined as cases with more than 90% of data missing on the SIP scale. From the 544 returned questionnaires, a total of 42 cases were deleted, resulting in 502 questionnaires suitable to be factor analysed. Two variables ('increased crime levels' and 'use of prohibited substances') were also removed from the data set prior to factor analysis. These were considered 'problem variables', having more than 50% missing data.

Another aspect of data screening is determining how suitable the data is to be factor analysed. A sample size of 502 cases is considered by Comrey and Lee (1992) to be a 'very good' number of useable cases. It is also important to consider the sample size in relation to the number of variables. The minimum requirement for factor analysis is typically a ratio of five cases to one variable (Gardner, 2005). In this research, the ratio was approximately thirteen cases to one variable, indicating that the data set was suitable for factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy is used as an indicator of how much a set of variables has in common. A value of 0.6 is considered good for factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). In this research, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.884. Measures of sampling adequacy (MSA) for individual variables were also examined, and all satisfied the recommended value of greater than 0.6 (Gardner, 2005). The correlation matrix was also inspected for the presence of some substantial correlations, considered to be those above 0.3 (Gardner, 2005). There were numerous correlations exceeding 0.3, which further supports the claim for the factorability of the data. Finally, it was decided that missing data would be dealt with using pairwise deletion.

Factor Extraction

As the purpose of the factor analysis was to identify the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals, common factor analysis was employed. Common factor analysis is the technique best suited to identifying underlying factors that summarise an original set of variables (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998; Gardner, 2005). In contrast, principal components analysis is more commonly used for data summarisation and reduction, rather than for identifying the underlying structure of a data set (Hair et al., 1998).

Deciding on the Number of Factors to Retain

Some of the most common criteria for determining the best number of factors to retain include Kaiser's stopping rule, the scree plot, percentage of variance explained and simple structure (Gardner, 2005). It is suggested that a number of these criteria be used in determining the number of factors, and that multiple solutions be examined prior to making this decision (Ford et al., 1986).

Using Kaiser's stopping rule to identify factors with eigenvalues greater than one, the initial extraction identified seven factors. Following this initial estimate, the scree plot was inspected, and it was decided to examine a number of trial solutions. It is suggested that factor solutions with one less, and also one or two more factors than were initially derived be examined (Hair et al., 1998; Gardner, 2005). Five-, six- and seven-factor solutions were examined and the final choice of the number of factors to retain used a combination of decision rules. The percentage of variance explained by the factor solution was considered, which requires a balance between explaining the greatest amount of variance possible and doing so with the least number of factors (Kachigan, 1986). Additionally, the factor solutions were examined for the best simple structure, considering a factor structure to be simple where "each variable loads heavily on one and only one factor" (Garson, 2004b, p. 19).

After examining and comparing each of the different factor solutions, and using the aforementioned decision rules, a decision was made for a six-factor solution, explaining 60.3% of variance. The results of the factor analysis are presented in chapter 4.

Factor Rotation

The final step in the factor analysis was to apply a rotation technique, used to "make sharper distinctions in the meanings of the factors" (Kachigan, 1986, p. 390). Rotation simplifies the pattern of factor loadings and in doing so, aids interpretation of the factors. The two approaches to rotation are orthogonal and oblique methods. Where simple structure cannot be achieved using orthogonal rotation, it is useful to try oblique rotation to achieve simple structure (Thompson, 2004). Unlike orthogonal rotation, "oblique rotations allow correlated factors instead of maintaining independence between the rotated factors" (Hair et al., 1998, p. 110). In situations where the researcher believes that their items are correlated, the underlying factors are likely to be similarly correlated, and therefore an oblique rotation may be appropriate (Child, 1970). Oblique rotation, using the direct oblimon approach, was used in this study because of the assumed relatedness of the social impact items, and therefore the assumed correlations between the underlying factors.

Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis is a statistical procedure used to identify and group objects or people that are similar on the basis of some set of defined characteristics (Hair & Black, 2000; McDaniel & Gates, 2007). "In cluster analysis we begin with an undifferentiated group and attempt to form subgroups which differ on selected variables" (Kachigan, 1986, p. 404). The purpose of cluster analysis is to identify clusters that maximise between-cluster variation, but minimise within-cluster variation (Kachigan, 1986). That is, objects within the same cluster should be very similar to one another, whereas objects in different clusters should be very different from each other.

In order to understand how different sub-groups in a community feel about a festival, cluster analysis using SPSS 14.0 was applied to the aggregated Hadley and Rockford data set. Cluster analysis comprised four main steps, discussed below under the subheadings of selection of clustering variables, clustering method, deciding on the number of clusters, and validation of the cluster solution.

Selection of Clustering Variables

Cluster analysis was previously defined as a method used to identify subgroups which differ on a set of selected characteristics (Kachigan, 1986). Before any subgroups can be identified, the researcher must decide on the set of characteristics upon which people will be clustered and, therefore, on what basis the resultant groups will be defined. The selection of these clustering variables often involves a combination of both theoretical and practical considerations (Hair et al., 1998).

The aim of the cluster analysis was to understand how different sub-groups in a community feel about a festival, and then to examine whether or not these clusters differed with respect to their perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. Demographic information including age, gender, education and employment was used in addition to a range of behavioural variables, such as the activities undertaken on festival weekend, volunteer involvement with the festival, and occupational connection to tourism, in order to group together similar members of the community (see table 6).

Table 6: Clustering Variables

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES	BEHAVIOURAL VARIABLES
▪ Gender ▪ Age ▪ Country of birth ▪ Years of Residence ▪ Distance from the festival site ▪ Education ▪ Employment ▪ Occupation ▪ Income	▪ Volunteer involvement with the festival ▪ Occupational connection to the tourism industry ▪ Economic benefits from the festival ▪ Feelings about the festival ▪ Level of interest in and support for the festival ▪ Activities on festival weekend

In addition to the theoretical considerations, the researcher also considered the practical outcomes of the cluster solution. The value of identifying subgroups of a community who feel differently about the festival lies in the ability of festival organisers and planners to make use of this information in the future planning and management of the festival. As this is an important outcome of this research, demographic characteristics in particular were seen to have practical value as part of the clustering base, given that clusters defined on demographics are relatively easy to identify and therefore communicate with (Mill & Morrison, 1998; Inbakaran & Jackson, 2005b).

"Ideally, only a small number of variables should be required to classify individuals" (Punj & Stewart, 1983, p. 146). These should be the set of variables that best differentiate between the clusters and which allow the most interpretable solution to be reached. It is important that a researcher does not try to include too many variables in the clustering base, as it has been found that even the inclusion of one or two irrelevant variables can greatly affect the usefulness and interpretability of the resulting clusters (Punj & Stewart, 1983). Although the clusters are initially defined on only a small number of key variables, as part of the interpretation and profiling process, the clusters are tested against a number of other relevant variables not used in the clustering process.

Clustering Method

There are two major types of clustering methods: partitioning methods and hierarchical methods (Arimond & Elfessi, 2001). Partitioning methods are based on "specifying an initial number of groups, and iteratively reallocating observations between groups until some equilibrium is attained" (Insightful Corporation, 2001, p. 115). K-Means clustering is one of the most common forms of cluster analysis using partitioning methods. This method is suited to large data sets consisting of only scale variables and is recommended when a researcher knows how many clusters they want (Norusis, 2006). In K-Means clustering, the researcher must specify in advance the number of clusters to be formed. Once given this number, the clustering procedure assigns cases into the specified number of clusters (SPSS, 2006). The need to specify cluster numbers in advance represents one of the major disadvantages of the K-Means method, particularly for a researcher who has no preconceived idea of the number of clusters, if any, which exist within a population (Arimond & Elfessi, 2001; Garson, 2004a; SPSS, 2006).

In addition to partitioning methods are hierarchical methods of clustering which "proceed by combining or dividing existing groups, producing a hierarchical structure displaying the order in which groups are merged or divided" (Insightful Corporation, 2001, p. 130). Hierarchical clustering is recommended for small data sets, typically with fewer than 250 cases (Garson, 2004a).

A newer method of clustering is two-step cluster analysis, which combines both partitioning and hierarchical methods in a two-stage procedure. The first step in the two-step procedure involves the creation of pre-clusters, which are many small sub-clusters which together hold all the cases. This is done in an effort to reduce the complexity of such a large data set. Based on an examination of the log-likelihood distance measure, each case is scanned to see whether it can be merged with a previously formed pre-cluster, or whether it must begin a new pre-cluster (Norusis, 2006). Once the pre-clustering stage is complete, the second step in the two-step procedure is the grouping of these pre-clusters into the final desired number of clusters. This is done using an agglomerative hierarchical clustering method (Norusis, 2006; SPSS, 2006). "Forming clusters hierarchically lets you explore a

range of solutions with different numbers of clusters" (Norusis, 2006, p. 381). As mentioned earlier, the selection of the best number of clusters can be done automatically by SPSS using the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). The best cluster solution is found at the point where the BIC is at its lowest value. This point represents the smallest change in distance between the two closest clusters in each hierarchical clustering stage (SPSS, 2006).

Two-step cluster analysis was chosen because it works well with large data sets, can handle continuous and categorical variables and is able to automatically determine the number of clusters or examine a range of specified solutions (Norusis, 2006). With a sample size of 544 cases, the hierarchical method was not appropriate. Whilst K-Means clustering can handle large data sets, this method can only handle continuous or scale variables, and the clustering variables in this case were all categorical. Also, K-Means clustering requires the number of clusters to be known in advance, and while the researcher assumed that each community was not homogenous, the number of clusters likely to be found was not known. The ability of the two-step method either to automatically determine the best number of clusters or to examine a range of specified solutions after providing an initial estimate of the best number of clusters was a desired feature of this approach.

Deciding on the Number of Clusters

One of the difficulties in deciding on the best number of clusters is that there is no right or wrong number of clusters (Norusis, 2006). There are no set criteria or objective measures which determine the best cluster solution, but rather "the selection of the final cluster solution requires substantial researcher judgement" (Hair et al., 1998, p. 479). Several authors recommend that a range of cluster solutions be examined and compared prior to making a decision for the best number of clusters (Hair et al., 1998; Garson, 2004a; SPSS, 2006). Therefore, in this research, possible cluster solutions ranging from two clusters to five clusters were tested in order to determine the optimum cluster solution needed.

Three criteria that are commonly used in deciding on the best number of clusters are: 1) the overall interpretability of the solution; 2) theoretical considerations and/or practical implications of the cluster solution; and 3) the contribution that each

variable makes to differentiating the clusters (Hair et al., 1998; Hair & Black, 2000; Norusis, 2006). A variable that does not differentiate between clusters will affect the quality and interpretability of the final result and should therefore be deleted from the analysis (Punj & Stewart, 1983). The deletion of these irrelevant variables allows for the clusters to be better defined, based only on those variables which play a role in distinguishing between different clusters (Hair et al., 1998). There were three variables which were initially included in the set of clustering variables but which were later deleted as they failed to significantly differentiate between the clusters. These were the three demographic variables of gender, country of birth and the distance a person lived from the festival site.

After examination and comparison of each of the different cluster solutions, a decision was made for a five-cluster solution. The five-cluster solution produced the clearest distinguishable set of clusters with good separation among each of the clusters based on the clustering variables. This solution also gave acceptable cluster sizes, with the two largest clusters accounting for 25.8% each and the smallest accounting for 12.6%. Overall this cluster solution provided an understandable interpretation of five distinct subgroups within each community who felt differently about a festival. The results of the cluster analysis, including the profiling and interpretation of the clusters, are presented in chapter 4, section 4.7.

Validation of the Cluster Solution

Given the level of subjectivity and researcher judgement in deciding on the number of clusters, it is particularly important that the final cluster solution be validated. Validation of the cluster solution is used to test that "the cluster solution is representative of the general population, and thus is generalisable to other objects and is stable over time" (Hair et al., 1998, p. 501). Cluster validation is commonly achieved by splitting a sample into two groups and running a cluster analysis on each sample separately (Hair et al., 1998). Comparison of the resulting cluster solutions should identify whether a similar result is achieved across the two samples.

In order to validate the chosen solution, separate cluster analyses were run on the Hadley and Rockford data sets. The same set of clustering variables was used in a two-step cluster analysis on each sample. It was found that a five-cluster solution

was most appropriate in both Hadley and Rockford. The profiles of the five clusters were very similar to those that were identified in the cluster analysis on the aggregated data set, which confirmed the acceptability of the aggregated approach. The only difference was in the size of the clusters and the order in which they appeared, which differed slightly across each community. This, however, reflects the same pattern achieved in the cluster analysis on the aggregated data set, for which it can be shown that some clusters were either overrepresented or underrepresented in one community or the other.

ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests

Once a five-cluster solution was chosen and validated, the research focus turned to investigating whether the five identified community subgroups held different perceptions of the social impacts of their community festival. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) identifies significant differences in the mean scores across a number of groups (Pallant, 2005) and was therefore used to compare the five clusters based on their perceptions of impacts. The F statistic, which represents the "variance between the groups, divided by the variance within the groups" (Pallant, 2005, p. 214), was used in determining significant differences between the clusters. A large F statistic is indicative of a significant difference between the means of one or more groups on a particular social impact variable (Norusis, 2005; Pallant, 2005).

An assumption underlying ANOVA testing is equal variances in the means of each group, typically examined using Levene's test for the homogeneity of variances. Where this assumption is violated, that is, where the variances of each of the group's means vary, the Welsh and Brown-Forsythe tests should be consulted in place of the ANOVA results, given that equal variances are not required (Pallant, 2005). Unequal variances are common where the sample sizes of the groups being compared are quite different, as is the case with the five clusters, ranging in size from 56 people in Cluster 2 to 115 people in each of Clusters 1 and 3. Given these differences in sample size and the subsequent violation of Levene's test, the Brown-Forsythe test has been used in place of the ANOVA result.

Whilst the ANOVA tests identify that significant differences exist somewhere between the mean scores of a set of groups, they do not show where these differences

lie (Pallant, 2005). In order to identify where these differences lie, that is, which specific group(s) are different from another group(s), a post hoc test must be performed. One common form of post hoc test in SPSS is a Tukey's multiple comparison procedure, which identifies which pairs of means are actually significantly different from each other. It does this by testing every possibility, comparing every pair of means to see where the significant differences lie (Norusis, 2005). In this research, Tukey's post hoc tests were conducted to identify which clusters were significantly different from other clusters based on their perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.

3.5.2 Qualitative Data Analysis Methods

Qualitative data gathered through semi-structured interviews and observation at each of the festivals was analysed with the aid of the NVivo qualitative software program. This program was also used to aid in the analysis of the qualitative data gained from the open-ended questions in the residents' perceptions questionnaire.

Qualitative data analysis is a process of ongoing discovery which involves a high level of familiarity with the data and ongoing examination and interpretation of the data and its emerging themes (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). To achieve a high level of familiarity with the data, the researcher read and re-read the notes and transcripts, identifying emerging themes and concepts. Whilst the existing literature can be a source of themes, most commonly "researchers induce themes from the text itself" (Ryan & Harvey, 2000, p. 780). Researchers can also use their own personal experience with the research setting and its participants in interpreting the data (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998).

"In qualitative research, coding is a way of developing and refining interpretations of the data" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 150). Coding is used both for data reduction and categorisation of the data into themes (Neuman, 2006). According to Willis (2006) coding can take on two main forms: open or axial coding. Open coding is carried out first and involves assigning the initial set of codes to a piece of text. Axial coding follows and involves the redefining of these initial open codes, with each becoming more clearly defined. Axial coding focuses on the organisation and

rearrangement of the existing codes and can involve splitting codes into subcategories, identifying relationships between codes or combining codes that are closely related (Neuman, 2006; Willis, 2006).

Within NVivo, the processes of open and axial coding are reflected in the creation of free and tree nodes. Nodes are the storage containers used for storing coding within NVivo. Free nodes "do not assume relationships with other concepts" (Bazeley & Richards, 2000, p. 25) and are therefore useful for open coding in the early stages of data analysis. The researcher began the coding process by reading each transcript and open coding the text, assigning free nodes to relevant sentences or paragraphs. The second step in coding was the organisation of the free nodes into tree nodes. Tree nodes are those which allow for hierarchical organisation into categories and subcategories (Bazeley & Richards, 2000) and are therefore useful for axial coding and the reorganisation of existing free nodes.

'Crossover track analysis' is commonly used in mixed method data analysis. This involves separate analyses of the qualitative and quantitative data, then the crossover of these forms for further comparisons and analysis (Greene et al., 2005). Typology development is a specific form of crossover analysis, which uses the "mid-stream results of one track of data analysis to generate a typology (a set of substantive categories) that is then used as a framework for analysing the other data track" (Greene et al., 2005, p. 276). Typology development was employed for coding of the qualitative open-ended responses on residents' expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of their festival. This involved using the underlying dimensions identified through the factor analysis as the framework and structure for analysis of the qualitative data. Using NVivo, the expected impacts were open coded according to the 41 social impact statements comprising the SIP scale. These statements were used as a guide to the classification of social impacts, both positive and negative. Those impacts expected by respondents which didn't match up with any of the existing impacts from the SIP scale were coded as 'community-identified' impacts. The expected impacts were then categorised into the underlying dimensions of social impacts identified through the factor analysis. The results of the factor analysis have also been used as the organising structure for the presentation of both the qualitative and quantitative results, which will become apparent in chapter 4.

The qualitative perceptions data were coded according to whether or not the respondents' expectations had been met. Open coding of the text using NVivo involved assigning free nodes to relevant sentences or paragraphs. The free nodes assigned to explain residents' perceptions included 'perceived the impact to have occurred', 'did not perceive the impact to have occurred' and 'don't know'. As some respondents felt the need to qualify their responses, and this qualification became important to making sense of the data, two additional codes were assigned: 'perceived the impact to have occurred with qualification' and 'did not perceive the impact to have occurred with qualification'.

Once coded, each piece of text was examined using conceptual or thematic analysis. "The focus of conceptual analysis is to identify any occurrences of the concepts… within the selected text or texts" (Sproule, 2006, p. 118). The researcher explored the text through its coding, identifying recurring themes which were drawn on in subsequent discussion and analysis.

3.6 Methodological Limitations

It is important to acknowledge a number of limitations associated with the selected research methodologies used in this study. Two key limitations are related to the use of focus groups. First, focus group participants are often selected on their capacity to provide the greatest amount of meaningful information, and this can limit the pool from which they can be drawn. The resultant bias that can stem from this is, however, only a problem if the researcher is unaware of it. That is, bias can only become a problem if "you interpret what you hear in the focus groups as representing a full spectrum of experiences and opinions" (Morgan, 1988, p. 45). In this research, although the focus group participants were selected from the volunteer database for each festival, the researcher had carefully considered the source of her participants, and any potential biases that the position of the festival volunteer might introduce. Any bias would have been outweighed by seeking the participation of those with a deep understanding of the festival.

Secondly, there is the potential for the results gained through focus groups to be biased by a dominant individual within the group (Thomas, 2004). In two of the focus groups conducted, there was a dominant individual, who at times tested the moderator's group management skills. To counter this, the researcher as moderator specifically sought out and encouraged responses from the other participants.

The researcher must also acknowledge the limitations that exist with reference to the residents' perceptions questionnaire. Whilst a mail questionnaire represented the most cost-effective way of reaching the greatest number of local residents, the issues of sample self-selection and non-response must be recognised. With any mail survey, the respondents represent a self-selected sample (Veal, 2006). Those who choose to respond to the questionnaire select themselves to be part of the sample, and those who choose not to respond effectively select themselves out of the sample. This self-selection process introduces a potential source of bias into the sample, known as non-response bias (Veal, 2006). Although no formal investigation of non-response was undertaken due to the limits of research funds, some assumptions about this bias can be made. Veal (2006) suggests that "those with 'something to say', whether positive or negative, are more likely to return their questionnaires than people who are apathetic". Whilst the researcher did consider the potential for those residents with either strong positive or strong negative opinions regarding their festival to be those returning questionnaires, an examination of the profile of respondents showed that this was not the case. The respondent profile represents a mix of residents who claimed to 'love the festival', 'tolerate the festival', and either 'dislike the festival, stay away during the festival, or adjust their lifestyle because of the festival'. Therefore, rather than just capturing the extremes of opinion, the responses reflect a range of more moderate and ambivalent views.

Another potential limitation relates to the open-ended questions in section A of the residents' perceptions questionnaire, which asked respondents to comment on their pre-festival expectations of the social impacts that may result from the festival. As the questionnaire was administered following the staging of the festival, it is possible that the subsequent experience of the festival may have affected the ability of respondents to recall their pre-festival expectations accurately. To address this potential limitation, the expectations questions were phrased in a way that would take

respondents back to their thoughts prior to the festival, assisting them to be reflective: "*thinking back*, please state what you expected the positive/negative social impacts of the festival to be". The fact that the questionnaire was administered within a few weeks of the festival would have also assisted with the recall process.

The researcher's own biases and potential to influence participants during the research must also be considered. "Every researcher brings something different to a study: different attitudes, values, perspectives, ideologies, etc., all of which impact upon the research" (Goodson & Phillimore, 2004, p. 33). The researcher reflected on, and remained conscious throughout the research process of her own biases, values and perspectives, and made every attempt not to let them influence participants. Within both the interviews and focus groups, the researcher was mindful not to steer participants towards expressing views that fitted within the researcher's own values and preconceptions about the topic. Instead, the researcher took care to view the situation and responses from the perspectives of each participant.

3.7 Summary

This research seeks to understand the social impacts that festivals have on the communities in which they are staged, by studying two Australian community festivals: the Hadley Music Festival and the Rockford Music Festival. This chapter has explained that the research employed a mixed methods approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative methodologies including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, observational techniques, document analysis and a residents' perceptions questionnaire. This approach will provide a more complete picture of the social impacts that festivals have on their host communities; as neither qualitative nor quantitative methods on their own would have been sufficient to answer this question.

This chapter discussed and justified the research methodology and paradigm, the selection of festivals, the data collection procedures, the methods used in analysing the data and, finally, the methodological limitations. Next, chapter 4 presents the

results from both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of this research, and a thorough discussion of these results follows in chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the empirical investigation. These findings address the following research questions:

- What are the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals?
- What are a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival?
- Are there distinct subgroups within a community who differ in their feelings towards a festival?
- Do these subgroups hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals?

The first section presents a detailed summary of the two festivals that were chosen for this research. Second, the demographic profile of the respondents in each community is presented, and then a comparison between the two communities is made. Third, the results of the factor analysis are presented, outlining six underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals. Fourth is the presentation of the quantitative results regarding each host community's perceptions of the social impacts of their festival. This section is based on the quantitative data gathered through the SIP scale as part of the residents' perceptions questionnaire. Fifth, the results of the open-ended questions on residents' expectations and perceptions of social impacts are discussed, based on the qualitative data from the residents' perceptions questionnaire. Respondents were asked to comment on what they *expected* the positive and negative social impacts of the festival to be, and whether or not they *perceived* these positive and negative social impacts to have occurred as a result of the festival. Both this qualitative data and the previous quantitative data are presented using the six underlying dimensions of social impacts identified through

the factor analysis. These dimensions were chosen as a suitable structure for organising and presenting the remainder of the data. Finally, the results of the cluster analysis are presented. Five community subgroups are identified and subsequently discussed in terms of their differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.

4.2 Detailed Summary of Festivals

This section presents a detailed summary of each of the festivals; the Hadley Music Festival and the Rockford Music Festival. This discussion serves to profile the festivals, and outlines their history and development, organisational structure, and what each festival offers to participants and the wider community.

4.2.1 Hadley Music Festival

The Hadley Music Festival was established in 1993 and has since been held annually each November, most recently staging its 14th festival in 2006. The festival represents a community initiative which was designed to bring visitors to Hadley in what was then a quiet time of the year. An informal Chamber of Commerce, comprised of interested members of the business community, put forward the idea for a festival. They did this at a public meeting to which all interested community groups were invited. It was at this meeting that the idea for the Hadley Music Festival was agreed upon. The idea for the festival stemmed from grassroots community interest and was progressed by a strong community base which formed the organising committee and large volunteer contingent. The organisers also viewed a festival as a good way to give something back to the community, like a celebration of the community.

During the weekend of the festival, approximately 16,000 visitors descend on Hadley, providing an instant boost to its local population of approximately 4,000 people. The festival programme offers participants a weekend of musical entertainment, beginning on Friday night, and ending on Sunday night. Throughout the weekend, music performances take place in various locations spread throughout Hadley, making use of both existing and constructed venues. Two existing venues used are the Repertory Theatre and the Town Hall. Among the constructed venues

are two large marquees, located within the centre of town, and a car park in the main street of Hadley which acts as an alfresco music venue. There are also four street stages spread throughout the main street, which offer free entertainment throughout the weekend. Performances also take place at local restaurants and cafes; however bookings are required to attend these venues. The main street of Hadley represents the stage for the free street party, held on the Saturday of the festival. The main street is closed off to traffic, and is filled with food and craft stalls, street stages featuring musical performances, and roaming entertainers including buskers.

The Hadley Music Festival Committee consists of seven members, including the chairperson, secretary, treasurer, music programmer, production coordinator, security and operations coordinator, and street party coordinator. Having a small organising committee means members are required to take on multiple roles. For example, the chairperson is also responsible for sponsorship, funding, volunteer coordination, merchandising, and acting as the community liaison. Similarly, the secretary is responsible for ticketing, accommodation, and venues coordination. The organising committee has been entirely voluntary based until recently, when in 2004, the secretary became the only paid member of the committee.

The Hadley Music Festival could not be staged without the dedicated group of volunteers, service clubs, voluntary organisations and committed community. The festival operates using a contingent of anywhere between 250 and 300 volunteers each year. While the majority of these volunteers are on the ground over the festival weekend, many also undertake their work in the lead up to, or following the festival. For their efforts, volunteers receive a 'volunteer pack', consisting of a Hadley Music Festival t-shirt and a ticket to the festival. These packs are distributed the night before the festival begins, at a volunteer barbeque hosted by the organising committee. The volunteers then get together after the festival for another barbeque, allowing them to celebrate their efforts. Local service clubs and voluntary organisations are also key to the operation of the festival. Many of these groups, including Apex, St. John's Ambulance Association, Lions Club, CWA, the Masonic Club, the local fire brigade, local schools and local sporting clubs, work at the festival for a fixed sum donation. For example, the local football club operates a bar

in one of the marquees, the Lions Club operates a food stall during the street party, and members of the Masonic Club man the gate at the camping grounds.

Over the years, the festival has maintained and encouraged its community focus, still organised by a majority voluntary organising committee made up of members of the local community. The festival also continues to contribute to the community as a whole, reinvesting the profits made by the festival back into the community of Hadley.

4.2.2 Rockford Music Festival

The Rockford Music Festival commenced in 1997 and celebrated its 10th year in 2006. A community forum was held in 1996, initiated by a local resident who recognised the decline in live music and entertainment in Rockford. It was at this meeting that he put forward the idea of hosting a music festival, and where the first Committee of Management for the Rockford Music Festival was established. While the festival was founded as a non-profit event to enliven the community, over time it has grown in size and increased in popularity, attracting visitors from outside Rockford.

The festival runs for three days every November, starting on Friday night and ending on Sunday night. The festival attracts approximately 10-12,000 visitors to Rockford, well outnumbering the local resident population of approximately 3,000 people. The Rockford Music Festival showcases a diversity of Australian music throughout the weekend, and operates across 10 live music venues. Seven of these venues are located within a designated 'festival precinct', situated at the end of the main street. Of these seven venues, three are existing buildings and four are specially constructed marquees and circus tents. Outside the festival precinct are another three smaller venues including the Town Hall and two outdoor stages, which feature local musicians and buskers. The festival features a youth program, which showcases emerging youth talent and includes a 'battle of the bands' competition. There is also a Kids Club with activities designed to keep younger children entertained. On both the Saturday and Sunday, the main street of Rockford is closed to traffic and the street is filled with food and market stalls and street performers including buskers, jugglers and circus acts. In addition to the main street stalls, the festival weekend

also coincides with the local Rockford community markets, held in a nearby local park, featuring local arts, crafts and food stalls.

The initial Management Committee formed to organise the inaugural festival in 1997 has since been replaced with a more formal management structure. The Rockford Music Festival Incorporated is a membership-based, not-for-profit registered organisation. Members, known as Friends of the Festival, include both individuals and businesses, which pay a membership fee to become part of the incorporated body. Unlike many other community festivals, the Rockford Music Festival operates under a business-like structure. There are three tiers of management starting with the Board of Management, followed by the Executive Management, and supported by a large volunteer contingent. The Board of Management is comprised of seven volunteer members including a chairperson, deputy chairperson, chair of finance and chair of risk management, plus three board members. Each of these board members has local connections to Rockford, and has business skills which can be applied to the management of the festival. As part of the Executive Management team, the festival employs a number of full-time, paid members of staff including a business manager, artistic director, music programmer and administrative assistant. Again, these people are drawn locally from Rockford, and many have been involved with the festival from its first year. In 2005, the artistic director of the festival retired, and the positions of artistic director and business manager were combined into one new position - General Manager. The existing business manager was appointed into this new role. Finally, there are approximately 60 volunteer team leaders who coordinate areas such as customer service, infrastructure, the artistic division, security and control functions. Working within these areas are approximately 450 volunteers who volunteer their time over the festival weekend and are critical to delivering the Rockford Music Festival each November.

Of the volunteers, approximately 300 are individual members from the local community. Approximately another 150 volunteers come from various community organisations such as the local fire brigade, Senior Citizens Association, the Coast Guard, Lions Club, the Scouts and several local schools. Volunteers receive a t-shirt and a free ticket to the festival in return for their efforts. Also, on the Sunday night

of the festival, the volunteers are invited, along with the festival organisers and other VIPs, to the 'wind-up party', to celebrate the weekend's efforts and achievements.

While the Rockford Music Festival continues to regard itself as a community festival, there are certain sections of the local community who are questioning whether the festival is in fact still a community festival, or whether it is now a business. This perception is stemming, in part, from the increasing professionalism of the festival's organisational structure, and highlights residents' concerns about losing the community aspect of their festival. It is the growth of the festival that is of concern to some residents. In recent years, the festival has been awarded the Victorian Tourism Award for 'Most Significant Festival and Event'. Having won this award three years in a row, the Rockford Music Festival achieved its place in the Victorian Tourism Awards 'Hall of Fame'. In summary, what began as a non-profit event to enliven the community has evolved over the years, and the new path that the festival is taking is now being questioned by certain segments of the local community.

4.3 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

4.3.1 Hadley Demographic Profile

Table 7 below presents the demographic profile of respondents to the Hadley residents' perceptions questionnaire. In all, 45.3% of respondents are male and 54.7% are female. In comparison to the demographic data collected in the 1996 Census, the sample shows females as being slightly overrepresented, and males slightly underrepresented. The largest percentage of respondents is aged 45-54 years (31.5%), followed by those aged 55-64 years (27.1%) and 35-44 years (16.7%). 66.8% of respondents are Australian-born, and 33.2% are overseas-born, which compared to the population Census figures, shows Australian-born persons as being somewhat underrepresented. Regarding the highest educational qualification achieved, 31.8% of respondents have completed either an undergraduate or postgraduate degree, and 29.4% have completed either a TAFE or trade qualification. The majority of respondents are in some form of employment, with 62.1% of respondents in either full-time, part-time, casual or self-employment. An additional 27.9% of respondents are retired. 60.4% of respondents are currently or were

previously working in either managerial/administration or professional occupations. Smaller percentages reported occupations in clerical work (10.8%), service work (9.6%) or as a tradesperson (9.2%). In terms of annual household income, while 23.2% of respondents preferred not to answer, 36.6% of respondents are earning less than $39,999 per year, 24% are earning between $40,000 and $79,999, and 16.2% are earning over $80,000.

Table 7: Hadley Demographic Profile

VARIABLE	%	VARIABLE	%
Gender (n = 254)		**Highest level of Education (n = 252)**	
Male	45.3%	No formal qualifications	3.2%
Female	54.7%	Year 10 or equivalent	17.9%
		Year 12 or equivalent	17.9%
Age (n = 251)		Undergraduate degree	17.1%
Under 24	1.6%	Postgraduate degree	14.7%
25 – 34	4%	TAFE qualification	17.1%
35 – 44	16.7%	Trade qualification	12.3%
45 – 54	31.5%		
55 – 64	27.1%	**Employment Status (n = 251)**	
65 – 74	13.9%		
75+	5.2%	Full-time employment	21.1%
		Part-time employment	16.3%
Place of Birth (n = 250)		Self–employed	23.9%
Australia	66.8%	Unemployed	1.6%
Overseas	33.2%	Retired	27.9%
		Student	0.8%
Current/Previous Occupation (n = 250)		Home duties	7.6%
		Casual employment	0.8%
Manager/Administrator	26.8%		
Professional	33.6%	**Annual Household Income (n = 254)**	
Tradesperson or related	9.2%		
Clerical worker	10.8%	Prefer not to say	23.2%
Service worker	9.6%	Less than $20,000	14.6%
Production worker	3.6%	$20,000 - $39,999	22.0%
Labourer or related	6.0%	$40,000 - $59,999	14.2%
Student	0.4%	$60,000 - $79,999	9.8%
		$80,000 - $99,999	7.5%
		Over $100,000	8.7%

4.3.2 Rockford Demographic Profile

The demographic profile of respondents to the Rockford residents' perceptions questionnaire is presented in table 8 below. In all, 43.4% of respondents are male and 56.6% are female, closely matching the gender breakdown in the 1996

population Census figures. The two largest percentages of respondents are aged 55-64 years (29.2%), followed by those aged 65-74 years (26.4%). 91.1% of respondents are Australian-born, and 8.9% are overseas-born, which very closely matches the Census figures. The majority of respondents have completed either a postgraduate degree or undergraduate degree as their highest level of education (53.6%), and a further 20.6% have completed either a TAFE or trade qualification. The majority of respondents are retired (52.7%), with an additional 42.8% in some form of employment (either full-time, part-time, casual or self-employment). A large majority of respondents (77.4%) are either currently or were previously engaged in managerial/administration or professional occupations. Smaller percentages reported occupations in clerical work (6.9%) and as a tradesperson (6.2%). In terms of annual household income, while 34.2% of respondents preferred not to say, 24.8% of respondents are earning less than $39,999 per year, 23.4% are earning between $40,000 and $79,999, and 17.6% are earning over $80,000.

Table 8: Rockford Demographic Profile

VARIABLE	%	VARIABLE	%
Gender (n = 281)		**Highest level of Education (n = 276)**	
Male	43.4%	No formal qualifications	1.4%
Female	56.6%	Year 10 or equivalent	12%
		Year 12 or equivalent	12.3%
Age (n = 277)		Undergraduate degree	26.4%
Under 24	1.4%	Postgraduate degree	27.2%
25 – 34	1.1%	TAFE qualification	14.1%
35 – 44	10.1%	Trade qualification	6.5%
45 – 54	15.9%		
55 – 64	29.2%	**Employment Status (n = 283)**	
65 – 74	26.4%		
75+	15.9%	Full-time employment	17%
		Part-time employment	11.3%
Place of Birth (n = 280)		Self-employed	14.1%
Australia	91.1%	Unemployed	0.7%
Overseas	8.9%	Retired	52.7%
		Student	0.4%
Current/Previous Occupation (n = 274)		Home duties	3.5%
		Casual employment	0.4%
Manager/Administrator	22.3%		
Professional	55.1%	**Annual Household Income (n = 274)**	
Tradesperson or related	6.2%		
Clerical worker	6.9%	Prefer not to say	34.2%
Service worker	5.5%	Less than $20,000	6.6%
Production worker	1.1%	$20,000 - $39,999	18.2%
Labourer or related	0.7%	$40,000 - $59,999	14.6%
Student	0.7%	$60,000 - $79,999	8.8%
Home Duties	1.5%	$80,000 - $99,999	7.7%
		Over $100,000	9.9%

4.3.3 Comparison of Hadley and Rockford Demographics

Having examined the demographic profile of the Hadley and Rockford respondents separately, some similarities and differences between the two can be identified. The biggest similarity between the two sets of respondents is the gender distribution: in

both Hadley and Rockford, a slightly larger proportion of females make up the sample. However, for each other demographic variable measured, considerable differences can be identified between the samples of respondents in each community.

Through an examination of the key demographic data collected, a profile of respondents in each community can be outlined. Hadley respondents are a younger to middle-aged group, working in either full-time, part-time or self-employment, with high school or TAFE/trade educational qualifications. In comparison, Rockford respondents are characterised by an older, majority Australian-born population, who although now retired, have achieved relatively high levels of education, namely undergraduate and postgraduate degrees.

Respondents in Hadley typically work in managerial/administration or professional occupations but also in trade, clerical and service occupations. Rockford respondents are more likely to be employed in professional or managerial/administration occupations, with smaller numbers in trade, clerical and service occupations. In terms of their annual household income, more respondents in Rockford than Hadley preferred not to provide an answer. While the two communities are similar in regard to the majority of income levels, Hadley respondents have a noticeably higher percentage of respondents earning less than $39,999 per year.

4.4 Factor Analysis

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the perceived social impacts of community festivals, factor analysis using SPSS 12.0 was applied to the 41-item SIP scale. Factor analysis represented a useful tool for refinement of the SIP scale, allowing for the simplification of a large number of variables into a smaller, more manageable number of factors or dimensions, which summarise the social impacts resulting from these community festivals. Common factor analysis using principal axis factoring was employed to identify the dimensions underlying the set of social impact variables. Oblique rotation, using the direct oblimon approach, allowed for correlated factors and produced the best simple structure, where each variable loaded clearly onto only one factor (Garson, 2004b). A decision was made for a six-factor solution, explaining 60.3% of variance.

Factor loadings were used in the interpretation and naming of the factors. Factor loadings represent "the degree to which each of the variables correlates with each of the factors" (Kachigan, 1986, p. 384). The variables with the highest loadings on a factor provide the greatest value in the interpretation and naming of a factor (Kachigan, 1986). As a guide to the interpretation of factor loadings, it is recommended that only variables with loadings of 0.32 and above be interpreted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). There were four items that didn't load onto any factor, and therefore were deleted from the analysis. The variables that failed to load were those that discussed the range of goods and services available, the price of goods and services, increased trade and the level of police presence. The remaining 35 items in the SIP scale are explained by the following six factors shown in table 9, with the factor labels provided below the table. Factor 4 initially had negative loadings, but the sign of the loadings was reversed for the presentation of results. The sign of the factor scores and any intercorrelations involving factor 4 were also reversed. "This procedure simplifies the presentation and discussion of results while remaining consistent with the substantiative findings" (Edwards, 2005, p. 6).

Table 9: Factor Loadings for the SIP Scale Using Principal Axis Factoring

ITEM	F1[a]	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	h^2
Increased traffic	.88	-	-	-	-	-	.83
Difficulty finding parking	.83	-	-	-	-	-	.76
Increased noise levels	.70	-	-	-	-	-	.75
Crowding in local facilities	.69	-	-	-	-	-	.52
Crowded streets	.63	-	-	-	-	-	.71
Increased litter	.60	-	-	-	-	.33	.74
Road closures	.50	-	-	-	-	-	.64
Enhanced community identity	-	.81	-	-	-	-	.65
Increased pride in the town	-	.78	-	-	-	-	.64
Shows the community as unique	-	.75	-	-	-	-	.63
Community ownership of the festival	-	.74	-	-	-	-	.56
Positive cultural impact	-	.70	-	-	-	-	.66
Togetherness within the community	-	.68	-	-	-	-	.64
Enjoyed having visitors	-	.40	-	-	-	-	.31
An image to encourage tourism	-	.36	-	-	-	-	.44
Frustration with visitors	-	-	.83	-	-	-	.72
Locals avoided the festival	-	-	.81	-	-	-	.65
Locals take second place to visitors	-	-	.63	-	-	-	.55
Disruption to normal routines	-	-	.59	-	-	-	.57
More visitors to the community	-	-	.42	.39	-	-	.59
Entertainment opportunities	-	-	-	.71	-	-	.49
Opportunities for social interaction	-	-	-	.70	-	-	.53
Meet new people	-	-	-	.64	-	-	.46
Shared family experiences	-	-	-	.61	-	-	.45
Cultural experiences	-	-	-	.61	-	-	.45
Diverse range of locals attended	-	-	-	.50	-	-	.39
Host family and friends	-	-	-	.49	-	-	.33
Develop new skills	-	-	-	-	.78	-	.62
Job opportunities	-	-	-	-	.71	-	.49
Fundraising opportunities	-	-	-	-	.63	-	.53
Display musical talents	-	-	-	-	.61	-	.51
Community groups work together	-	-	-	-	.38	-	.54
Vandalism increased	-	-	-	-	-	.80	.92
Delinquent behaviour	-	-	-	-	-	.78	.91
Underage drinking	-	-	-	-	-	.77	.88
% Variance*	28.7	18.9	4.6	3.5	2.8	1.9	
Eigenvalues	10.4	7.0	2.0	1.7	1.4	0.9	

[a] Factor labels:

F1 – Inconvenience; ***F2*** – Community identity and cohesion; ***F3*** – Personal frustration; ***F4*** – Entertainment and socialisation opportunities; ***F5*** – Community growth and development; ***F6*** – Behavioural consequences.

Coefficients < 0.32 suppressed; Communalities (h^2); *Total variance explained 60.3%

Factor 1, ‘inconvenience’, represents the issues related to the hosting of a festival that inconvenience members of the local community. These include issues of traffic congestion, difficulties finding car parking, having roads closed and having the streets and facilities crowded during the time of the festival. Increased noise levels and litter are also considered by residents to be sources of inconvenience.

Factor 2, ‘community identity and cohesion’, relates to impacts resulting from the festival that enable community members to feel a sense of identity and connectedness. Feelings of togetherness and a sense of ownership of the festival instil feelings of pride in local residents. Residents also gain pride from the idea that they are displaying the uniqueness of their community. It is these things that allow local community members to develop a sense of identity.

Factor 3, ‘personal frustration’, reflects the negative impacts that personally affect local residents. In particular, these impacts relate to the frustration felt by residents resulting from having more visitors in their community. Residents feel as though they take second place to visitors and become frustrated because their everyday routines are disrupted. It is these impacts that influence residents to avoid the festival.

Factor 4, ‘entertainment and socialisation opportunities’, identifies the positive opportunities that residents gain as a result of hosting a festival. These opportunities include meeting new people and interacting on a social level, having more visitors in the community, having opportunities for interacting and sharing experiences with family members and being able to host family and friends during the festival.

Factor 5, ‘community growth and development’, summarises the skill development and other opportunities arising from the festival which allow the community to grow and develop. Community members are able to develop new skills and are presented with job opportunities as a result of hosting the festival. Community groups are also given the opportunity to work together to stage the festival, with benefits for the community stemming from this collaboration. Furthermore, these community groups are presented with opportunities to raise money through fundraising, which can be used to further develop the community in the future.

Factor 6, 'behavioural consequences', reflects the negative behavioural consequences that residents perceive to result from the hosting of a festival. Variables in this factor include underage drinking, delinquent behaviour, vandalism and increased litter.

4.4.1 Split Loadings

Whilst this six-factor solution was chosen for its good simple structure, there are two items that have split loadings, meaning that they load on more than one factor (Gardner, 2005). As these items had loadings greater than 0.32, they can be interpreted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) and can be considered as items that are more complex in their meaning and that fit into and contribute to the interpretation of more than one factor. More visitors in the community loads onto both factor 3, personal frustration (0.42), and factor 4, entertainment and socialisation opportunities (0.39). The reasoning behind this is that having more visitors in the community is seen by some residents as a negative but by others as a positive. Based on those who see more visitors as a negative, this variable loads onto factor 3. The presence of increased visitors is the cause of resident frustration and the source of disruption to their everyday lives. However, based on those who see more visitors as a positive impact, this variable also loads onto factor 4. Here more visitors are recognised as being related to opportunities for meeting new people and having social interactions.

Litter is the second item with a split loading, loading onto both factor 1, inconvenience (0.60), and factor 6, behavioural consequences (0.33). The reasoning behind this is that residents are able to see two impacts related to litter: the act of littering and also the physical result of littering. Based on residents who see the result of littering as the problem, this variable loads onto factor 1. Residents are inconvenienced by having to clean up their private property and wider community after it has been littered. This variable also loads onto factor 6, as some residents see the actual act of littering as the negative impact. The act of littering is seen as a negative behavioural consequence which results from the festival, which therefore fits into factor 6 with other negative behaviours such as underage drinking and vandalism.

4.4.2 Reliability Analysis

"Reliability and factor analysis are complementary procedures in scale construction and definition" (Coakes & Steed, 2003, p. 157). Therefore for each factor, Cronbach's alpha was calculated as a measure of internal consistency, shown below in table 10.

Table 10: Reliability Statistics

FACTOR	CRONBACH'S ALPHA
Inconvenience	.940
Community identity and cohesion	.883
Personal frustration	.870
Entertainment and socialisation opportunities	.788
Community growth and development	.843
Behavioural consequences	.958

The high alpha values for each factor indicate good internal consistency among the items within each factor, meaning they produce a reliable scale (Coakes & Steed, 2003). Cronbach's alpha was also calculated for the entire 35 item SIP scale, with a value of 0.924.

4.4.3 Intercorrelations between Factor Scores

Where oblique rotation is used, it is recommended that correlations between the factor scores are calculated, given the useful role they can play in further interpretation of the factors (Edwards, 2005). The intercorrelations between the factors are displayed in table 11. Using pairwise deletion to deal with missing data, the effective sample size for the factor scores and intercorrelations was substantially reduced (n = 60). In order to check whether the large amount of missing data was introducing any inaccuracies into the result, the factor scores and intercorrelations were re-run using mean substitution (Gardner, 2005). Mean substitution increases the effective sample size and removes the problem of missing data. The factor scores and resultant intercorrelations showed no substantial difference between the pairwise

and mean substitution solutions; therefore the researcher can be confident in the results of the pairwise solution.

Cohen (1988) suggests that in interpreting the strength of a correlation, values greater than 0.50 represent 'large' correlations. A number of large correlations between the factor scores were found using Pearson's Correlation (*r*). The largest correlation was found between factor 1 and factor 6 ($r = 0.699$, $p < 0.01$), as shown in table 11. This positive correlation indicates that inconvenience is related to behavioural consequences. Factor 2 is highly correlated to factor 4 ($r = 0.649$, $p < 0.01$) indicating that community identity and cohesion is related to socialisation and entertainment opportunities. Factor 2 (community cohesion and identity) is also highly correlated with factor 5 (0.633, $p < 0.01$), community growth and development. The only other large correlation is between factor 1 and factor 3 ($r = 0.527$, $p < 0.01$), which suggests that inconvenience and personal frustration are positively related.

Table 11: Intercorrelations Between Factor Scores (n = 60, pairwise deletion)

FACTOR	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Inconvenience	-					
2. Community identity and cohesion	0.206	-				
3. Personal frustration	0.527**	-0.181	-			
4. Socialisation and entertainment opportunities	0.446**	0.649**	0.014	-		
5. Community growth and development	0.121	0.633**	-0.033	0.474**	-	
6. Behavioural consequences	0.699**	0.274*	0.255*	0.446**	-0.027	-

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Factor analysis identified inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences as the six dimensions underlying the social impacts of community festivals. Refinement of the SIP scale using factor

analysis replaces the complexity of a large range of social impact variables with a six-factor structure that summarises the social impacts resulting from community festivals.

4.5 Residents' Perceptions of Impacts – Quantitative Results

The results from the SIP scale provide quantitative information on each host community's perceptions of the social impacts of their festival. These results are presented in a series of tables organised around the six underlying dimensions of social impacts presented previously. These dimensions, identified through factor analysis, were chosen as a suitable structure for organising and presenting the remainder of the data.

Thus there are separate results tables for inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences. There is also a table which presents the miscellaneous impacts that didn't fit into any of the identified factors during the factor analysis.

Interpreting the Results

Within each of the tables presented in this section, the impact occurrence and mean impact level are presented for each impact statement. Using table 12 below as a guide, this section explains how to interpret the results presented in sections 4.5.1 and 4.5.2.

Table 12: Interpreting the Impact Results Tables

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL
During the festival, the footpaths and streets were crowded	YES	93.1%	+1.3
	NO	4.5%	+0.7
	DON'T KNOW	2.4%	-

Under the column 'IMPACT OCCURRENCE' there are three rows labelled YES, NO and DON'T KNOW. These refer to the response options for whether residents perceived an impact to have occurred or not. Reading across for each of these response options is the percentage of respondents who answered YES, NO and DON'T KNOW to the impact statement. These percentage breakdowns into the response categories are used to measure the level of agreement on the occurrence of an impact. The column 'MEAN IMPACT LEVEL' represents the mean (average) level of impact for those respondents who answered YES and NO respectively. Note that there is no mean impact level for the DON'T KNOW responses, since those who responded in this way were not required to give an impact rating. The numbers in the mean impact level column are representative of a level of impact, corresponding with the SIP scale presented in table 13 (below). Standard rounding can be used to understand the level of impact being presented; for example, a mean level of impact of +0.8 would be rounded up to represent a *very small positive impact*. Where mean results are a mid-point, for example +0.5 or –0.5, the rule adopted is that they are rounded down towards zero, that is, towards the neutral/no impact point.

Table 13: SIP Scale Level of Impact

-5 = very large negative impact	-4 = large negative impact	-3 = moderate negative impact	-2 = small negative impact	-1 = very small negative impact
		0 = neutral / no impact		
+1 = very small positive impact	+2 = small positive impact	+3 = moderate positive impact	+4 = large positive impact	+5 = very large positive impact

The tables in the following section present impacts in the order based on the highest to the lowest YES response. That is, the first item in each table is that which had the highest percentage YES response, down to the impact which had the smallest YES percentage response. In addition to being arranged from highest to lowest YES response, the items in the miscellaneous impacts table are organised so that similar themed impact items are grouped together.

Each host community's perceptions of the social impacts of their festival will now be discussed in turn.

4.5.1 Hadley Quantitative Perceptions of Impacts

Perceived Inconvenience Impacts

Responses for inconvenience impacts (see table 14) show that there is a relatively high level of agreement on the occurrence of these impacts. That is, the majority of respondents agreed that the inconvenience impacts resulted from the staging of the festival. Large percentages of respondents perceived the footpaths and streets to be crowded (93.1%), that noise levels increased (92.6%), that there was increased traffic (91.9%) and that there was crowding in local shops and facilities (72%). At lower levels, yet still representing a majority opinion, respondents perceived there to be increased litter (65.9%) and difficulty finding car parking (63.4%) and that road closures and redirections inconvenienced locals during the festival (58.2%).

Table 14: Perceived Inconvenience Impacts – Hadley

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
During the festival, the footpaths and streets were crowded.	YES	93.1%	+1.3
	NO	4.5%	+0.7
	DON'T KNOW	2.4%	-
During the festival, noise levels in the area surrounding the festival venues were increased.	YES	92.6%	-0.3
	NO	2.1%	+1.2
	DON'T KNOW	5.3%	-
During the festival there was increased traffic in my community.	YES	91.9%	-0.3
	NO	6.1%	-0.9
	DON'T KNOW	2.0%	-
There was crowding in local shops and facilities during the festival.	YES	72.0%	+0.2
	NO	14.0%	+0.5
	DON'T KNOW	14.0%	-
During the festival there was increased litter in the areas surrounding festival venues.	YES	65.9%	-1.1
	NO	22.8%	+0.9
	DON'T KNOW	11.3%	-
There was difficulty finding car parking during the festival.	YES	63.4%	-0.9
	NO	30.0%	+0.1
	DON'T KNOW	6.6%	-
Road closures and redirections during the festival inconvenienced locals.	YES	58.2%	-1.3
	NO	34.4%	+0.3
	DON'T KNOW	7.4%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

The majority of impacts that were perceived to have occurred have been rated as negative in nature, although they were not rated as having high levels of negative impact. The largest rating for an inconvenience impact was for the impact of road closures and redirections on locals (-1.3) which represents a *very small negative impact*. Two impacts perceived to have occurred were judged to be positive in nature, and both relate to crowding: crowded footpaths and streets (+1.3) was

perceived to have a *very small positive impact*, and crowding in shops and facilities (+0.2) was given a positive rating, but equates to *neutral/no impact.*

The small minority of respondents who answered NO to each impact statement disagreed that the inconvenience impacts occurred. In all cases except one, the non-occurrence of these impacts was rated as having either *neutral/no impact*, or a *very small positive impact*, which shows that respondents are happy that the inconvenience impacts did not occur. There was only one case in which the non-occurrence of an impact was rated as negative. Respondents who did not perceive traffic to have increased saw this as having a *very small negative impact* (-0.9).

Perceived Community Identity and Cohesion Impacts

For each impact in this category, the majority of respondents agreed with the statements, indicating that they perceived this range of impacts on community identity and cohesion to have resulted from the festival (see table 15). A large majority of respondents perceived the festival to have given the community an image which encourages tourism (89.2%), enhanced community identity (82.8%) and helped show others why the community is unique and special (80%). The majority of respondents also perceived a sense of community ownership of the festival (72.7%), that locals enjoyed having visitors during the festival (69.1%), that the festival had a positive cultural impact (68.1%), that the festival contributed to community togetherness (65.9%) and that local pride increased because of the festival (62.9%).

Table 15: Perceived Community Identity and Cohesion Impacts – Hadley

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
The festival gives the community an image which encourages tourism to the region.	YES	89.2%	+3.5
	NO	3.6%	-2.3
	DON'T KNOW	7.2%	-
Community identity is enhanced through the festival.	YES	82.8%	+3.4
	NO	7.6%	-1.2
	DON'T KNOW	9.6%	-
The festival helps to show others why the community is unique and special.	YES	80.0%	+3.4
	NO	11.2%	-0.9
	DON'T KNOW	8.8%	-
There is a sense of community ownership of the festival.	YES	72.7%	+3.3
	NO	12.7%	-1.9
	DON'T KNOW	14.6%	-
Local residents enjoyed having visitors in the region during the festival.	YES	69.1%	+3.0
	NO	11.8%	-3.1
	DON'T KNOW	19.1%	-
The festival had a positive cultural impact in the community.	YES	68.1%	+3.2
	NO	12.1%	-2.2
	DON'T KNOW	19.8%	-
The festival contributed to a sense of togetherness within the community.	YES	65.9%	+3.4
	NO	14.1%	-1.6
	DON'T KNOW	20.0%	-
Because of the festival, the pride of local residents in their town has increased.	YES	62.9%	+3.3
	NO	13.9%	-2.0
	DON'T KNOW	23.2%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

In each case, respondents perceived these impacts to be positive. The positive ratings are all quite high, with each impact rated at a level of +3.0 or above, which represents a *moderate positive impact.* The impact with the largest positive rating is that the festival gives the community an image which encourages tourism (+3.5)

followed by an enhanced community identity, the festival showing others why the community is unique and special (+3.4) and a sense of community togetherness (+3.4).

For the small percentage of NO respondents who did not perceive the stated impacts to have occurred, negative impact ratings were assigned. The non-occurrence of these impacts is rated negative in nature, with ratings ranging between a *very small negative impact* and a *moderate negative impact*. Essentially, these respondents saw certain impacts as potential positive impacts that didn't occur as a result of the festival. Respondents who disagreed that local residents enjoyed having visitors in the region during the festival saw this as having the largest negative impact, with a rating of -3.1.

Perceived Personal Frustration Impacts

In the category of personal frustration impacts (see table 16), respondents disagreed that local residents avoided the attractions at the festival (42.1%), that locals took second place to visitors in their own community during the festival (52.7%) and that residents were frustrated with an increased number of visitors during the festival (48.3%). For each of these impacts, respondents perceived there to be either *neutral/no impact* or a *very small positive impact*.

Table 16: Perceived Personal Frustration Impacts – Hadley

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
The festival leads to a disruption in the normal routines of local residents.	YES	79.2%	-0.3
	NO	16.7%	+0.5
	DON'T KNOW	4.1%	-
Local residents avoided the attractions at the festival.	YES	36.8%	-1.0
	NO	42.1%	+1.1
	DON'T KNOW	21.1%	-
Locals took second place to visitors in their own community during the festival.	YES	35.9%	-0.9
	NO	52.7%	+0.3
	DON'T KNOW	11.4%	-
Residents were frustrated with an increased number of visitors during the festival.	YES	28.9%	-1.4
	NO	48.3%	+0.5
	DON'T KNOW	22.8%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

Although the largest percentage of respondents answered NO to the above three impacts, the remainder of the responses in each instance were split between the YES and DON'T KNOW response categories. This suggests that different respondents have different perceptions of these impacts, and that respondents are quite divided over these impacts.

Respondents who agreed to the occurrence of the personal frustration impacts have given only *very small negative impact* ratings. The highest rating was for residents being frustrated with the increased number of visitors (-1.4), which represents a *very small negative impact*.

The only statement to which a large majority of respondents agreed was that the festival leads to a disruption in the normal routines of locals (79.2%). Regardless of their agreement with this impact occurring, the impact rated -0.3 which equates to *neutral/no impact*.

Perceived Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities

The majority of respondents in this category were in agreement with the statements, indicating that they perceived this range of impacts on entertainment and socialisation opportunities to have resulted from the festival (see table 17). A large majority of respondents perceived the festival to have brought more visitors to the community (98%); increased entertainment opportunities for the local community (95.6%); opportunities for local residents to host family and friends from out of town (92.3%); opportunities for social interaction with other members of the community (89.9%); and the opportunity for local residents to meet new people from outside the community (89%). Large percentages of respondents also perceived the festival to have provided local residents with increased opportunities for cultural experiences (79.8%) and opportunities for shared family experiences (77.4%), and perceived a diverse range of people from the local community to have attended the festival (76.3%).

Table 17: Perceived Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities – Hadley

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
During the festival there were more visitors to the community.	YES	98.0%	+3.7
	NO	0.4%	.
	DON'T KNOW	1.6%	-
During the festival there were increased entertainment opportunities for the local community.	YES	95.6%	+3.5
	NO	2.4%	-1.0
	DON'T KNOW	2.0%	-
The festival provided local residents with opportunities to host family and friends from out of town.	YES	92.3%	+3.4
	NO	2.4%	-2.0
	DON'T KNOW	5.3%	-
The festival provided opportunities for social interaction with other members of the community.	YES	89.9%	+3.1
	NO	5.6%	-2.3
	DON'T KNOW	4.5%	-
The festival provided local residents with the opportunity to meet new people from outside the community.	YES	89.0%	+2.7
	NO	5.7%	-1.7
	DON'T KNOW	5.3%	-
The festival provided local residents with increased opportunities for cultural experiences.	YES	79.8%	+2.9
	NO	10.1%	-2.0
	DON'T KNOW	10.1%	-
The festival provided opportunities for shared family experiences.	YES	77.4%	+3.2
	NO	11.3%	-2.6
	DON'T KNOW	11.3%	-
A diverse range of people from the local community attended the festival.	YES	76.3%	+2.8
	NO	2.9%	-2.0
	DON'T KNOW	20.8%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

The occurrence of these impacts is perceived to have had positive impacts on the community, with all impacts rated +2.7 or above. Having more visitors in the community was rated as a *large positive impact* (+3.7), while increased

entertainment opportunities for the local community (+3.5) and opportunities to host family and friends from out of town (+3.4) were rated as *moderate positive impacts*.

Also, for the small percentages of respondents who perceived these impacts not to have occurred, small to moderate negative impact ratings have been assigned. The highest negative rating was by those respondents who disagreed that the festival provided opportunities for shared family experiences, who rated this as a *moderate negative impact* (-2.6).

Perceived Community Growth and Development Impacts

For each impact in this category, a majority of respondents agreed that community growth and development impacts occurred as a result of the festival (see table 18). A large majority of respondents agreed with the following statements: that the festival provided opportunities for local residents to display their musical talents (88.9%); that community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival (85%); and that the festival provided fundraising opportunities for local community groups (82.9%). Respondents also perceived there to have been increased job opportunities for locals during the festival (63%) and that the festival provided opportunities for members of the community to develop new skills (57.1%).

Table 18: Perceived Community Growth and Development Impacts – Hadley

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
The festival provided opportunities for local residents to display their musical talents.	YES	88.9%	+3.3
	NO	2.5%	-2.2
	DON'T KNOW	8.6%	-
Community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival.	YES	85.0%	+3.5
	NO	3.3%	-2.3
	DON'T KNOW	11.7%	-
The festival provided fundraising opportunities for local community groups.	YES	82.9%	+3.8
	NO	4.5%	-2.0
	DON'T KNOW	12.6%	-
During the festival there were increased job opportunities for locals.	YES	63.0%	+3.1
	NO	17.5%	-1.1
	DON'T KNOW	19.5%	-
The festival provided opportunities for members of the community to develop new skills.	YES	57.1%	+2.7
	NO	15.5%	-1.0
	DON'T KNOW	27.4%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

All impacts in this category that were perceived to have occurred were assigned either a *moderate positive impact* or *large positive impact* rating. The highest rated impact was that the festival provided fundraising opportunities for local community groups (+3.8), which represents a *large positive impact.*

The NO responses in this category were all assigned negative impact ratings of either a *very small* or *small negative impact.* This suggests that respondents who perceived these impacts not to have occurred saw this to be a negative. The largest negative impact was assigned by those respondents who disagreed that community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival (-2.3), rated as having a *small negative impact*.

Perceived Behavioural Consequences

What is noticeable in this category is that there are a number of questions in which there exists a distinct lack of agreement regarding the occurrence of an impact. This is illustrated by the fact that responses are spread over the three impact categories of YES, NO and DON'T KNOW, as seen in table 19.

Table 19: Perceived Behavioural Consequences – Hadley

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
There is increased rowdy and delinquent behaviour during the festival.	YES	51.2%	-1.4
	NO	26.4%	+0.2
	DON'T KNOW	22.4%	-
Underage drinking occurred during the festival.	YES	38.6%	-1.7
	NO	9.6%	+0.9
	DON'T KNOW	51.8%	-
Vandalism in the community increased during the festival.	YES	30.5%	-1.9
	NO	29.3%	+0.8
	DON'T KNOW	40.2%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

Regarding increased rowdy and delinquent behaviour during the festival, a relatively small majority of 51.2% agreed that this had occurred. There were also relatively even percentages of NO (26.4%) and DON'T KNOW (22.4%) responses related to this impact. For the impacts of underage drinking and vandalism in the community, relatively low YES responses were met with higher responses in the DON'T KNOW category. While 38.6% of respondents perceived underage drinking to have occurred during the festival, the highest response was in the DON'T KNOW category with 51.8% of responses. Similarly for vandalism in the community, only 30.5% of respondents perceived this to have occurred, while the highest response of 40.2% was for DON'T KNOW.

As for the impact rating, those respondents who answered YES, that the stated impacts occurred, have assigned relatively low negative impact ratings. Respondents

assigned a *small negative impact* to both underage drinking (-1.7) and vandalism (-1.9), and registered a *very small negative impact* for rowdy and delinquent behaviour (-1.4).

Those respondents who answered NO, disagreeing with the occurrence of the impacts, have assigned positive impact ratings, reflecting that it is a positive for the community when these types of behavioural consequences do not occur.

Perceived Miscellaneous Impacts

The impacts in this category are those that were either not included in the factor analysis because of missing data or deleted during the factor analysis because they did not fit into any of the identified factors. The six items, however, have been grouped into two categories: impacts related to trade, and impacts related to crime and security issues. Common patterns of response were found between several of these impacts (see table 20).

Table 20: Perceived Miscellaneous Impacts – Hadley

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
During the festival there was increased trade for local businesses.	YES	92.9%	+3.6
	NO	1.3%	-3.3
	DON'T KNOW	5.8%	-
There was a larger range of goods and services available for sale in the community during the festival.	YES	72.2%	+2.5
	NO	13.7%	-1.6
	DON'T KNOW	14.1%	-
During the festival, the prices of goods and services in the community increased.	YES	44.9%	-0.7
	NO	34.6%	+0.6
	DON'T KNOW	20.5%	-
The presence of police during the festival was adequate.	YES	78.8%	+2.7
	NO	4.8%	-1.6
	DON'T KNOW	16.4%	-
The use of prohibited substances increased during the festival.	YES	32.1%	-1.7
	NO	5.2%	+0.9
	DON'T KNOW	62.7%	-
Crime in the community increased during the festival.	YES	31.3%	-1.8
	NO	25.3%	+0.5
	DON'T KNOW	43.4%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

There were three impacts which relate to trade outcomes of the festival. For two of these, the majority of respondents agreed that these impacts occurred as a result of the festival. Respondents agreed that during the festival there was increased trade for local businesses (92.9%) and that there was a larger range of goods and services available for sale during the festival (72.2%). Each of these was rated as a positive impact, with increased trade for local businesses given the highest rating of +3.6, which represents a *large positive impact.* The third trade impact, that the prices of goods and services increased during the festival, shows a lack of agreement regarding its occurrence, illustrated by the split responses between the three impact categories. 44.9% of respondents perceived the prices of goods and services in the

community to have increased during the festival; 34.6% of respondents disagreed with this statement; and 20.5% responded DON'T KNOW.

The other three impacts in this category relate to crime and security issues arising out of the festival. Two of these impacts are similar in that they both have the largest percentage of responses in the DON'T KNOW category. While only 32.1% of respondents perceived an increased use of prohibited substances during the festival, the highest response was in the DON'T KNOW category with 62.7% of responses. Similarly for crime in the community, only 31.3% of respondents perceived this to have occurred, while the highest response of 43.4% was for DON'T KNOW. In each case, those respondents who answered YES and perceived the impacts to have occurred assigned a *small negative impact* rating. The majority of respondents agreed with the final impact in this category, perceiving the presence of police during the festival to have been adequate (78.8%). This was rated to be a *moderate positive impact* (+2.7).

4.5.2 Rockford Quantitative Perceptions of Impacts

Perceived Inconvenience Impacts

The majority of respondents were in agreement with the statements in this category, indicating that they perceived the specified inconvenience impacts to have resulted from the festival (see table 21). A large majority of respondents perceived the following impacts to have occurred during the festival: traffic was increased (95.5%); the footpaths and streets were crowded (87.4%); and noise levels in the area surrounding the festival venues were increased (85.8%). A majority of respondents also perceived there to have been difficulty finding car parking during the festival (79.4%), increased litter in the areas surrounding festival venues (71.4%) and crowding in local shops and facilities (69.7%), and that road closures and redirections during the festival inconvenienced locals (61%).

Table 21: Perceived Inconvenience Impacts – Rockford

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
During the festival there was increased traffic in my community.	YES	95.5%	-1.3
	NO	1.5%	+0.5
	DON'T KNOW	3.0%	-
During the festival, the footpaths and streets were crowded.	YES	87.4%	-0.4
	NO	3.7%	-0.8
	DON'T KNOW	8.9%	-
During the festival, noise levels in the area surrounding the festival venues were increased.	YES	85.8%	-1.6
	NO	2.6%	-0.4
	DON'T KNOW	11.6%	-
There was difficulty finding car parking during the festival.	YES	79.4%	-1.6
	NO	8.2%	+0.4
	DON'T KNOW	12.4%	-
During the festival there was increased litter in the areas surrounding festival venues.	YES	71.4%	-2.0
	NO	9.3%	+1.3
	DON'T KNOW	19.3%	-
There was crowding in local shops and facilities during the festival.	YES	69.7%	-0.5
	NO	10.3%	-1.7
	DON'T KNOW	20.0%	-
Road closures and redirections during the festival inconvenienced locals.	YES	61.0%	-1.8
	NO	22.3%	-0.2
	DON'T KNOW	16.7%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

For each of these impacts which respondents perceived to have occurred, a negative impact rating was given. The two items perceived to have the greatest negative impact were the increase in litter (-2.0) and the inconvenience caused by road closures and redirections (-1.8), both representing a *small negative impact.*

The small percentages of respondents who disagreed that the impacts occurred have, on the whole, given impact ratings that equate to a *neutral/no impact* rating. One

exception is the *very small positive impact* rating given by those respondents who disagreed that litter increased during the festival (+1.3). The other exception is the negative impact ratings given to the non-occurrence of the two crowding impacts: respondents who disagreed that local shops and facilities were crowded rated this a *small negative impact* (-1.7), and those who disagreed that the footpaths and streets were crowded rated this a *very small negative impact* (-0.8).

Perceived Community Identity and Cohesion Impacts

For five impact items in this category, there is a lack of certainty as to whether the impacts occurred, as illustrated by the split of responses between the three response categories (see table 22). This is not the case for three of the impacts, for which a relatively large majority of respondents have answered YES, agreeing that the festival gives the community an image which encourages tourism (80.1%), that community identity is enhanced through the festival (68.9%) and that the festival helps show others why the community is unique and special (60.6%). Respondents' perceptions, however, are split as to whether local residents enjoyed having visitors in the region during the festival; whether the festival had a positive cultural impact in the community; if there is a sense of community ownership of the festival; if the festival contributed to a sense of togetherness within the community; and if the pride of local residents in their town increased because of the festival.

Table 22: Perceived Community Identity and Cohesion Impacts – Rockford

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
The festival gives the community an image which encourages tourism to the region.	YES	80.1%	+2.8
	NO	11.2%	-3.4
	DON'T KNOW	8.7%	-
Community identity is enhanced through the festival.	YES	68.9%	+2.8
	NO	19.8%	-3.0
	DON'T KNOW	11.3%	-
The festival helps to show others why the community is unique and special.	YES	60.6%	+2.9
	NO	27.7%	-2.5
	DON'T KNOW	11.7%	-
Local residents enjoyed having visitors in the region during the festival.	YES	54.1%	+2.4
	NO	24.4%	-3.3
	DON'T KNOW	21.5%	-
The festival had a positive cultural impact in the community.	YES	52.4%	+2.5
	NO	27.8%	-2.5
	DON'T KNOW	19.8%	-
There is a sense of community ownership of the festival.	YES	51.3%	+2.8
	NO	27.5%	-2.6
	DON'T KNOW	21.2%	-
The festival contributed to a sense of togetherness within the community.	YES	48.0%	+2.5
	NO	31.3%	-2.4
	DON'T KNOW	20.7%	-
Because of the festival, the pride of local residents in their town has increased.	YES	41.3%	+3.0
	NO	27.9%	-1.9
	DON'T KNOW	30.8%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

Common to all the impacts in this category is that for all respondents who answered YES, a positive impact rating has been assigned, and for all respondents who answered NO, a negative impact rating has been assigned. Also, all of the impact ratings are relatively high, rated either as a *small* or *moderate impact*, for both the

positive and negative impacts. The highest positive ratings were assigned by those respondents who agreed that the pride of local residents increased because of the festival (+3.0) and that the festival helps show others why the community is unique and special (+2.9), which are both *moderate positive impact* ratings. The highest negative ratings were assigned by those respondents who disagreed that the festival gives the community an image which encourages tourism (-3.4), and that local residents enjoyed having visitors in the region (-3.3), both rated as having a *moderate negative impact*.

Perceived Personal Frustration Impacts

A clear pattern of response is not evident in the category of personal frustration impact, as seen in table 23. A large majority of respondents agreed that the festival leads to a disruption in the normal routines of local residents (88.9%). Just over half of the respondents agreed that locals took second place to visitors during the festival (54.1%) and that residents were frustrated with an increased number of visitors during the festival (50.7%); however for both of these impacts, the remaining responses were split between the NO and DON'T KNOW response categories. This suggests that respondents did not agree on the occurrence of these impacts. This is also the case for the final item regarding whether locals avoided the attractions at the festival. The responses for this item are split almost equally between the three response categories, although the largest response was in the YES category, agreeing that locals avoided the attractions at the festival (39%).

Table 23: Perceived Personal Frustration Impacts – Rockford

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
The festival leads to a disruption in the normal routines of local residents.	YES	88.9%	-1.3
	NO	7.4%	+0.6
	DON'T KNOW	3.7%	-
Locals took second place to visitors in their own community during the festival.	YES	54.1%	-1.4
	NO	30.8%	+0.2
	DON'T KNOW	15.1%	-
Residents were frustrated with an increased number of visitors during the festival.	YES	50.7%	-2.0
	NO	27.2%	+0.4
	DON'T KNOW	22.1%	-
Local residents avoided the attractions at the festival.	YES	39.0%	-1.9
	NO	31.1%	+1.1
	DON'T KNOW	29.9%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

As for the impact ratings, those respondents who answered YES, that the stated impacts occurred, have assigned relatively low negative impact ratings. Respondents assigned a *small negative impact* to residents being frustrated with an increased number of visitors during the festival (-2.0) and to local residents avoiding the attractions at the festival (-1.9), and registered a *very small negative impact* to locals taking second place to visitors during the festival (-1.4) and the festival disrupting the normal routines of local residents (-1.3).

Those respondents who disagreed with the occurrence of the impacts have assigned impact ratings equivalent to either *neutral/no impact* or a *very small positive impact*.

Perceived Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities

In the category of entertainment and socialisation opportunities, the majority of respondents agreed on the occurrence of these impacts as a result of the festival (see table 24). The majority of respondents perceived there to have been more visitors to the community during the festival (97.8%), increased entertainment opportunities

(83.5%), increased opportunities for social interaction with other members of the community (79.8%), increased opportunities to host family and friends from out of town (74.2%), increased opportunities for cultural experiences (73.1%), the opportunity to meet new people from outside the community (72.5%) and opportunities for shared family experiences (70.5%). Responses were split for whether a diverse range of people from the local community attended the festival, with 50.4% answering YES, 39.1% answering DON'T KNOW, and 10.6% answering NO.

Table 24: Perceived Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities – Rockford

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
During the festival there were more visitors to the community.	YES	97.8%	+2.2
	NO	0.4%	+1.0
	DON'T KNOW	1.8%	-
During the festival there were increased entertainment opportunities for the local community.	YES	83.5%	+3.2
	NO	7.7%	-3.7
	DON'T KNOW	8.8%	-
The festival provided opportunities for social interaction with other members of the community.	YES	79.8%	+2.7
	NO	12.5%	-2.6
	DON'T KNOW	7.7%	-
The festival provided local residents with opportunities to host family and friends from out of town.	YES	74.2%	+2.8
	NO	10.7%	-3.0
	DON'T KNOW	15.1%	-
The festival provided local residents with increased opportunities for cultural experiences.	YES	73.1%	+2.6
	NO	16.8%	-2.8
	DON'T KNOW	10.1%	-
The festival provided local residents with the opportunity to meet new people from outside the community.	YES	72.5%	+2.0
	NO	16.0%	-2.2
	DON'T KNOW	11.5%	-
The festival provided opportunities for shared family experiences.	YES	70.5%	+2.7
	NO	14.0%	-2.2
	DON'T KNOW	15.5%	-
A diverse range of people from the local community attended the festival.	YES	50.4%	+2.1
	NO	10.6%	-2.1
	DON'T KNOW	39.0%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

A pattern that can be observed in this category of impacts is that all impacts that were perceived to have occurred were rated as having a positive impact, and all impacts perceived not to have occurred were rated as negative impacts. The largest positive impact perceived by respondents was that the festival provided increased

entertainment opportunities, which they saw as having a *moderate positive impact* (+3.2). This same impact was also given the highest negative rating by those respondents who disagreed that the festival provided entertainment opportunities. This was rated *a large negative impact* (-3.7).

Perceived Community Growth and Development Impacts

In the category of community growth and development impacts, what is noticeable is the lack of agreement regarding the occurrence of these impacts. This is illustrated by the spread of responses over the three impacts categories of YES, NO and DON'T KNOW, as shown in table 25.

Table 25: Perceived Community Growth and Development Impacts – Rockford

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
Community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival.	YES	67.9%	+2.8
	NO	10.2%	-2.8
	DON'T KNOW	21.9%	-
The festival provided opportunities for local residents to display their musical talents.	YES	48.5%	+2.3
	NO	23.7%	-1.9
	DON'T KNOW	27.8%	-
During the festival there were increased job opportunities for locals.	YES	47.9%	+2.4
	NO	19.9%	-1.5
	DON'T KNOW	32.2%	-
The festival provided opportunities for members of the community to develop new skills.	YES	40.1%	+2.2
	NO	22.7%	-1.4
	DON'T KNOW	37.2%	-
The festival provided fundraising opportunities for local community groups.	YES	38.6%	+2.6
	NO	23.2%	-2.2
	DON'T KNOW	38.2%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

Only one item in this category stands out as having a clear majority response, which was the 67.9% of respondents who agreed that community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival. The remainder of the items, however, show a

distinct split of responses between the three impact categories. Respondents failed to agree on whether the festival provided opportunities for local residents to display their musical talents, whether there were increased job opportunities for locals during the festival, if the festival provided opportunities for locals to develop new skills, and if the festival provided fundraising opportunities for local community groups. In each case the highest percentage of responses was in the YES category; however, this did not represent a majority response, with relatively large percentage responses also in the NO and DON'T KNOW categories.

What is common to all impacts in this category which were perceived to have occurred is that they were rated as positive impacts. Also, all impacts perceived not to have occurred were rated to be negative in nature. The highest positive rating for the occurrence of an impact was that community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival (+2.8), rated as a *moderate positive impact*. This same item also received the highest negative rating assigned by respondents who did not feel that community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival (-2.8), rated a *moderate negative impact.*

Perceived Behavioural Consequences

What is noticeable in this category is that although the majority response for each item is YES, each item also has a significant percentage of responses in the DON'T KNOW category, and quite small levels of NO response (see table 26). A majority of respondents agreed that there was increased rowdy and delinquent behaviour during the festival (71.9%), that underage drinking occurred (64.6%) and that vandalism in the community increased during the festival (52.2%). However, significant proportions of respondents replied DON'T KNOW to these items, unable to judge their occurrence. Almost half the respondents were unable to judge whether vandalism increased during the festival, with 44.5% of respondents answering DON'T KNOW. 34.3% of respondents answered DON'T KNOW regarding the occurrence of underage drinking at the festival, and 21.9% answered DON'T KNOW regarding increased rowdy and delinquent behaviour.

Table 26: Perceived Behavioural Consequences – Rockford

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
There is increased rowdy and delinquent behaviour during the festival.	YES	71.9%	-2.4
	NO	6.2%	+0.3
	DON'T KNOW	21.9%	-
Underage drinking occurred during the festival.	YES	64.6%	-2.7
	NO	1.1%	+1.3
	DON'T KNOW	34.3%	-
Vandalism in the community increased during the festival.	YES	52.2%	-2.6
	NO	3.3%	+0.4
	DON'T KNOW	44.5%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

Where these impacts were judged to have occurred as a result of the festival, they were given quite large negative ratings. Underage drinking (-2.7) and vandalism (-2.6) were perceived to have the greatest negative impacts, both given a *moderate negative impact* rating. Increased rowdy and delinquent behaviour (-2.4) was considered by respondents as a *small negative impact*.

For the small minority of respondents who answered NO to these impacts, disagreeing that they occurred as a result of the festival, two out of three items were rated as having *neutral/no impact*. Those who didn't think that underage drinking occurred rated this as a *small positive impact* (+1.3).

Perceived Miscellaneous Impacts

This category of miscellaneous impacts consists of those items that were not included in the factor analysis. However, some common patterns of response have been found between several of the impacts in this category, as shown in table 27. Three of these impacts relate to trade outcomes of the festival, and three relate to crime and security issues.

Table 27: Perceived Miscellaneous Impacts – Rockford

IMPACT STATEMENT	IMPACT OCCURRENCE	%	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
During the festival there was increased trade for local businesses.	YES	81.7%	+3.2
	NO	9.9%	-2.6
	DON'T KNOW	8.4%	-
There was a larger range of goods and services available for sale in the community during the festival.	YES	57.9%	+1.8
	NO	18.5%	-1.3
	DON'T KNOW	23.6%	-
During the festival, the prices of goods and services in the community increased.	YES	22.2%	-1.7
	NO	29.6%	+0.2
	DON'T KNOW	48.2%	-
Crime in the community increased during the festival.	YES	35.0%	-2.8
	NO	6.2%	+0.5
	DON'T KNOW	58.8%	-
The presence of police during the festival was adequate.	YES	29.5%	+2.1
	NO	29.5%	-3.7
	DON'T KNOW	41.0%	-
The use of prohibited substances increased during the festival.	YES	24.8%	-2.5
	NO	1.8%	+0.8
	DON'T KNOW	73.4%	-

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

Two of the trade impacts show a similar response pattern in that the majority response was YES, agreeing that these impacts occurred as a result of the festival. A majority of respondents agreed that during the festival there was increased trade for local businesses (81.7%) and that there was a larger range of goods and services available for sale during the festival (57.9%). Each of these was rated as a positive impact, with increased trade for local businesses given the highest rating of +3.2, representing a *moderate positive impact*, and the larger range of goods and services available rated as a *small positive impact* (+1.8). The third trade impact, regarding the increased price of goods and services, showed a lack of agreement with responses split between the response categories. Although not a majority response, the largest

response was in the DON'T KNOW category, with 48.1% of respondents not sure whether the price of goods and services increased or not.

Of the crime and security-related impacts, two of these had a clear DON'T KNOW majority response. A majority of respondents answered DON'T KNOW regarding the use of prohibited substances during the festival (73.4%) and whether crime increased during the festival (58.8%). In each case, the percentage of respondents who answered YES and perceived the impacts to have occurred assigned a negative impact rating. The 35% of respondents who agreed that crime increased during the festival assigned a *moderate negative impact* rating (-2.8), and the 24.8% of respondents who agreed that the use of prohibited substances increased during the festival assigned a *small negative impact* rating (-2.5). The final impact related to crime and security is that the level of police presence during the festival was adequate. This impact gained a split response, with the largest response in the DON'T KNOW category. While 29.5% perceived the police presence to have been adequate and another 29.5% perceived it not to have been adequate, the highest response of 41.1% was for DON'T KNOW. Interestingly, the highest negative impact rating for the non-occurrence of an impact was by those respondents who perceived the level of police presence not to have been adequate. This was rated as having a *large negative impact* (-3.7).

4.5.3 Comparison of Hadley and Rockford Perceptions of Impacts

The above section provided insights into each host community's perceptions of the social impacts of their festival. These results were presented separately for each community, in each instance grouped under the six underlying dimensions of social impacts identified through the factor analysis. Discussion of individual impact items in each factor was presented.

This section will now draw comparisons between the results from the two communities to identify any similarities or differences between their perceptions of the social impacts of their festivals. This discussion will focus on the similarities and differences based on their perceptions of impact occurrence, and perceptions of the nature and level at which the impacts occurred. Whilst sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2

discussed perceptions related to individual impact items making up each factor, this section will look at average values for the factor as a whole. The following discussion will show that whilst respondents in Hadley and Rockford perceived the occurrence of certain impacts differently, they are quite similar in their ratings of these impacts as either positive or negative in nature.

Perceptions of Impact Occurrence

Table 28 below presents the average impact occurrence response for respondents who answered YES, NO and DON'T KNOW to the impact statements grouped under the relevant factor. These figures are an average of the impact occurrence ratings for the individual impact statements which make up each factor, and the results for both Hadley and Rockford are shown separately. Discussion of this table will show how the two communities differ with regard to their perceptions of impact occurrence.

Table 28: Mean Impact Occurrence Response for Each Factor

FACTOR	HADLEY		ROCKFORD	
Inconvenience	YES	76.7%	YES	78.6%
	NO	16.3%	NO	8.3%
	DON'T KNOW	7%	DON'T KNOW	13.1%
Community identity and cohesion	YES	73.8%	YES	57.1%
	NO	10.9%	NO	24.7%
	DON'T KNOW	15.3%	DON'T KNOW	18.2%
Personal frustration	YES	45.2%	YES	58.2%
	NO	40%	NO	24.1%
	DON'T KNOW	14.8%	DON'T KNOW	17.7%
Entertainment and socialisation opportunities	YES	87.3%	YES	75.2%
	NO	5.1%	NO	11.1%
	DON'T KNOW	7.6%	DON'T KNOW	13.7%
Community growth and development	YES	75.4%	YES	48.6%
	NO	8.7%	NO	20%
	DON'T KNOW	15.9%	DON'T KNOW	31.4%
Behavioural consequences	YES	40.1%	YES	62.9%
	NO	21.8%	NO	3.5%
	DON'T KNOW	38.1%	DON'T KNOW	33.6%

Three factors which display strong similarities regarding impact occurrence between Hadley and Rockford are inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, and entertainment and socialisation opportunities. All have a majority response in the YES category, indicating that respondents in both Hadley and Rockford perceived these types of impacts to have resulted from the staging of their festival. Whilst the figures are quite close for inconvenience impacts between the two communities, for both community identity and cohesion and entertainment and socialisation opportunities, Hadley has a significantly higher YES percentage response than Rockford.

Three factors which display differences regarding impact occurrence between Hadley and Rockford are personal frustration, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences.

Regarding personal frustration impacts, responses in Hadley are split relatively evenly between the YES and NO categories. This result suggests that respondents in Hadley have not reached agreement on the occurrence of the personal frustration impacts and that whilst some respondents perceived them to have occurred, others who disagreed had a different perception. Rockford is quite different in that it has a majority YES response, meaning that the majority of respondents perceived personal frustration impacts to have resulted from their festival.

Regarding the occurrence of impacts on community growth and development, the responses differ substantially between Hadley and Rockford. The majority of respondents in Hadley answered YES to each impact statement, agreeing that the range of community growth and development impacts occurred as a result of their festival. In Rockford, however, there was a lack of agreement regarding the occurrence of these impacts, illustrated by the spread of responses over the three response categories. This suggests that a greater amount of community growth and development impacts was perceived to have occurred in Hadley than in Rockford.

The responses regarding the occurrence of behavioural consequences in Hadley and Rockford are quite different. In Hadley, responses are spread between the three response categories, with the closest split between the YES and DON'T KNOW

categories. Rockford is quite different in that it has a majority YES response, meaning that the majority of respondents perceived these behavioural consequences to have resulted from their festival. What is similar between the two communities is that following the highest percentage YES response, the next largest response is in the DON'T KNOW category. This suggests that for some respondents, the behavioural consequences of a festival may have been one type of impact they felt unable to judge.

The category of miscellaneous impacts does not appear in table 28 (presented above). As discussed previously, the items that make up this category are not clearly related and do not comprise a factor as such. Given that the items are not clearly related, it is not appropriate to take an average of the impact occurrence ratings for the individual impact statements in this category. Instead, the similarities and differences between the impact occurrence ratings given by respondents in Hadley and Rockford will be discussed for each item individually, rather than using an average for the category. Table 29 below compares the Hadley and Rockford impact occurrence responses for each miscellaneous impact individually. This table shows that for five out of the six impacts in this category, there are similarities between impact occurrence responses in Hadley and Rockford. A similar format will be used here as in previous discussion of the miscellaneous impacts, with the items grouped into those related to trade impacts of the festival, and impacts related to crime and security.

Table 29: Impact Occurrence Response for Miscellaneous Impacts

MISCELLANEOUS IMPACTS	HADLEY		ROCKFORD	
During the festival there was increased trade for local businesses.	YES	92.9%	YES	81.7%
	NO	1.3%	NO	9.9%
	DON'T KNOW	5.8%	DON'T KNOW	8.4%
There was a larger range of goods and services available for sale in the community during the festival.	YES	72.2%	YES	57.9%
	NO	13.7%	NO	18.5%
	DON'T KNOW	14.1%	DON'T KNOW	23.6%
During the festival, the prices of goods and services in the community increased.	YES	44.9%	YES	22.2%
	NO	34.6%	NO	29.6%
	DON'T KNOW	20.5%	DON'T KNOW	48.2%
The use of prohibited substances increased during the festival.	YES	32.1%	YES	24.8%
	NO	5.2%	NO	1.8%
	DON'T KNOW	62.7%	DON'T KNOW	73.4%
Crime in the community increased during the festival.	YES	31.3%	YES	35.0%
	NO	25.3%	NO	6.2%
	DON'T KNOW	43.4%	DON'T KNOW	58.8%
The presence of police during the festival was adequate.	YES	78.8%	YES	29.5%
	NO	4.8%	NO	29.5%
	DON'T KNOW	16.4%	DON'T KNOW	41.0%

The three impacts related to trade outcomes of the festival show strong similarities in the responses in both Hadley and Rockford. Firstly, a majority of respondents in both communities agreed that the festival created increased trade for local businesses and that a larger range of goods and services were available for sale during the festival. Secondly, responses in both Hadley and Rockford reveal a lack of agreement on whether the price of goods and services increased during the festival, illustrated by the spread of responses between the YES, NO and DON'T KNOW categories.

Two of the impacts related to crime and security issues show a similar pattern of response across the two communities. The largest percentage of responses in both Hadley and Rockford answered DON'T KNOW to whether there was increased

crime in the community and increased use of prohibited substances during the festival. This result suggests that these are impacts for which many respondents, across both communities, felt unable to judge.

Whilst responses in both Hadley and Rockford have been similar for the previous impacts, the two communities differ in regard to their perceptions of whether the presence of police during the festival was adequate. In Hadley, a large majority of respondents answered YES, agreeing that the presence of police during the festival was adequate. In comparison, the responses in Rockford were split between the response categories, illustrating a distinct lack of agreement between respondents as to whether the presence of police during the festival was adequate or not.

The previous discussion has highlighted the similarities and differences in the perceptions of impact occurrence between respondents in Hadley and Rockford. Those factors for which responses between the two communities were similar include inconvenience, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community identity and cohesion. On the other hand, responses were substantially different for the personal frustration, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences factors.

Perceptions of Impact Nature and Level

The discussion above has shown that respondents in Hadley and Rockford differ with regard to their perceptions of impact occurrence. This section will now show how residents' perceptions of the nature of an impact, whether it had a positive or negative impact on the host community, are quite similar in each community. What was considered a negative impact in one community was also perceived that way in the other, and similarly with positive impacts. Table 30 below presents the mean (average) level of impact for each factor, assigned by those respondents who answered YES and NO respectively. Similar to the presentation of mean impact ratings in earlier sections of this chapter, the numbers are representative of a level of impact from -5 to +5, corresponding with the SIP scale. These figures are an average of the impact ratings for the individual impact statements which make up each factor, and the results between Hadley and Rockford can be compared.

Table 30: Mean Impact Level for Each Factor

FACTOR	HADLEY		ROCKFORD	
	RESPONSE CATEGORY	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]	RESPONSE CATEGORY	MEAN IMPACT LEVEL[ab]
Inconvenience	YES	-0.3	YES	-1.3
	NO	+0.4	NO	-0.1
Community identity and cohesion	YES	+3.3	YES	+2.7
	NO	-1.9	NO	-2.7
Personal frustration	YES	-0.9	YES	-1.6
	NO	+0.6	NO	+0.6
Entertainment and socialisation opportunities	YES	+3.2	YES	+2.5
	NO	-1.7	NO	-2.2
Community growth and development	YES	+3.3	YES	+2.5
	NO	-1.7	NO	-2.0
Behavioural consequences	YES	-1.7	YES	-2.6
	NO	+0.6	NO	+0.7

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

On average, respondents in both Hadley and Rockford perceived impacts in the inconvenience, personal frustration and behavioural consequences factors to be negative in nature. Impacts perceived to have occurred within these factors were assigned negative ratings. Across the two communities, inconvenience impacts were rated to have the lowest level of impact, averaging neutral to very small negative impact. Personal frustration impacts rated slightly higher, averaging a rating of very small to small negative impact. Behavioural consequences achieved the highest negative impact ratings, averaging small to moderate negative impact ratings. For each of these categories of impacts, ratings were higher in Rockford than in Hadley. This suggests that Hadley respondents perceived lower levels of negative impacts resulting from their festival and that Rockford respondents perceived higher levels of negative impacts.

Impacts perceived not to have occurred within the inconvenience, personal frustration and behavioural consequences factors were perceived to have either

neutral or no impact or, at most, a very small positive impact. This was standard across the two communities.

The impacts that were perceived to be positive in nature were in the community identity and cohesion, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community growth and development factors. Respondents in both Hadley and Rockford assigned positive impact ratings to the impacts that were perceived to have occurred in these three factors. In both communities, and for each of the three factors, the positive impact ratings were quite large, on average, rated between a small and moderate positive impact. What is also noticeable, in comparing the two communities, is that for each of these factors, the positive impacts were rated higher in Hadley than they were in Rockford. This suggests that Hadley respondents perceived higher levels of positive impacts to result from their festival than did respondents in Rockford.

Impacts in the community identity and cohesion, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community growth and development factors that were perceived not to have occurred were rated as negative impacts. Respondents in both Hadley and Rockford saw the non-occurrence of these impacts as a negative, with ratings ranging from small to moderate negative impacts throughout all the factors. These relatively high levels of negative impact suggest that respondents recognised the importance of these types of impacts resulting from a festival. This is particularly the case for respondents in Rockford, who have given the highest ratings for the non-occurrence of these types of impacts. This suggests that it is respondents in Rockford more than Hadley who very much wanted to see these types of impacts occur as a result of their festival.

It can therefore be seen that respondents in both Hadley and Rockford shared similar views on the nature of impacts and whether these impacts have positive or negative impacts on the host community. Impacts within the inconvenience, personal frustration and behavioural consequences factors were perceived, on average, to be negative in nature. Impacts in these factors that were perceived to have occurred have been rated as having a negative impact, and impacts perceived not to have occurred have been rated as positive impacts. Impacts within the community identity

and cohesion, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community growth and development factors were perceived, on average, as positive in nature. Impacts perceived to have occurred in these factors were rated as positive impacts, and impacts perceived not to have occurred have been rated as negative impacts. Whilst this rule applies to the majority of cases, there are a small number of exceptions. The above figures are averages and therefore we cannot necessarily label some factors 'positive' and some 'negative', because within each factor, what some people saw as positive others saw as negative.

Within the inconvenience factor for example, whilst the majority of impacts perceived to have occurred were rated as negative in nature, there was an exception related to two crowding impacts. In Hadley, those respondents who agreed that the footpaths and streets were crowded and that there was crowding in shops and facilities assigned very small positive impact ratings. This shows that for some people, crowding was perceived as a positive impact for a host community.

There were also two exceptions to the rule that impacts in these factors perceived *not* to have occurred were rated as positive impacts. In Hadley, respondents who perceived increased traffic not to have occurred assigned this a very small negative impact rating. Also, in Rockford, the non-occurrence of the crowding impacts, related to the footpaths and streets, and shops and facilities being crowded, drew a negative rating from respondents. These results indicate that respondents would have liked to have seen more traffic and crowding in their community, with this 'busyness' possibly representing to them a more successful festival.

Therefore, whilst earlier discussion has referred to factors in which the respondents perceived mostly positive or mostly negative impacts, this discussion is taking an average of all responses, and the above exceptions illustrate that certain impacts in these factors can be perceived differently by different people.

4.6 Residents' Expectations and Perceptions of Impacts – Qualitative Results

This section presents the findings of the open-ended questions on residents' expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. This discussion is based on responses to the questions which asked a) what respondents *expected* the positive/negative social impacts of the festival to be, and b) if they *perceived* these positive/negative social impacts to have occurred.

The expectations data tells us the range of social impacts, both positive and negative, that residents expected to occur as a result of the hosting of a festival. The expected impacts were categorised into the six underlying dimensions of social impacts that were identified through the factor analysis: inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal disruption, socialisation and entertainment opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences. Whilst some of these expected impacts matched up with impacts previously identified by the researcher and included within the SIP scale, there were additional impacts identified by respondents that were not featured in the SIP scale. These were labelled 'community-identified' impacts.

It was found that all of the impacts included in the SIP scale, as well as the 'community-identified' impacts, were able to be organised around the six dimensions of social impacts. This qualitative data therefore supports the six dimensions of social impacts identified through the factor analysis, given that the impacts which respondents listed without prompting fit into the previously defined dimensions. This finding serves to reinforce the comprehensive nature of the six identified dimensions of social impacts of community festivals.

The perceptions data tells us whether respondents perceived the expected positive and negative social impacts to have occurred. These responses were coded according to whether or not the respondents' expectations had been met. By analysing the differences between expectations and perceived actual impacts, the perceptions data provides insight into the community's level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the festival. However, more important than whether the impacts were perceived to have

occurred or not, were the more detailed qualitative responses provided. Many respondents provided a qualified perception response, which added a number of exceptions and justifications to their response on whether an impact occurred or not. These qualifications help to further explain residents' perceptions of the positive and negative social impacts of community festivals.

The results are first presented for residents' expectations and perceptions of the positive social impacts, followed by a similar discussion for the negative social impacts.

4.6.1 Residents' Expectations and Perceptions of Positive Social Impacts

In all 523 people, representing 96% of the total sample, responded to the question asking them to state what they expected the positive social impacts of the festival to be. Respondents in both Hadley and Rockford expected 30 positive social impacts. 27 respondents said they expected there to be no positive impacts and 16 respondents had no expectations at all.

Of the 30 expected positive social impacts, 17 matched up with the positive social impact statements featured in the SIP scale, and 13 were additional impact items identified by respondents which were not included in the SIP scale. These 13 items have been termed 'community-identified' impacts. All positive social impacts could be grouped under three dimensions of social impacts, as identified in the factor analysis: community identity and social cohesion, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community growth and development. The dimensions and expected positive social impacts are presented in table 31 below. This table illustrates three important things. First, it lists the range of positive social impacts which respondents expected to result from their festival. These are listed in order of the most frequently mentioned impact to the least mentioned impact within each dimension. Second, it distinguishes between the impacts which were previously identified in the SIP scale and those additional impact items which were identified by respondents (shown with an asterisk against them). Third, table 31 shows how both sets of expected impacts fit within three of the underlying dimensions of social impacts previously identified through factor analysis.

Table 31: Expectations of Positive Social Impacts

EXPECTED POSITIVE SOCIAL IMPACTS *	
Community identity and cohesion	***Community growth and development***
Togetherness within the community	Impacts on local trade
Community ownership of the festival	Raises the profile of the town*
Community spirit*	Money to the community*
Positive cultural impact	Tourism*
Increased pride in the town	Fundraising opportunities
Enhanced community identity	Community groups work together
	Encourages people to move here*
Entertainment and socialisation opportunities	Encourages music interest and skills*
Entertainment opportunities	Good for the town*
Opportunities for social interaction	Display musical talents
A good time*	Job opportunities
More visitors to the community	Improvements to infrastructure*
Brings a small town alive*	Develop new skills
Meet new people	
Shared family experiences	
A diverse range of visitors attend*	
Host family and friends	
The free street party*	
Youth-related impacts*	

* Additional impact identified by the community

There are six positive impacts grouped under the dimension of community identity and cohesion. These are impacts resulting from the festival that allowed community members to feel a sense of identity and connectedness, and include feelings of togetherness, community spirit, enhanced community identity and pride in the town. Togetherness within the community was expressed by respondents as the festival *"bringing a lot of community members together"*, *"uniting the town in a combined positive effort"* and *"bringing the community together as a community event"*. Respondents also expected a sense of community ownership of the festival, in particular due to volunteer involvement with the festival. Respondent quotations include *"there is a heck of a lot of residents doing volunteer work for the festival, over the weekend and leading up to it and this creates a sense of being part of it"*

and *"the volunteer base is strong, they are all positive and have a sense of ownership of the festival"*.

In all 11 positive social impacts group under the dimension of entertainment and socialisation opportunities. Respondents expected that by staging a festival in their community, they would benefit from the associated entertainment opportunities, such as the *"opportunity to attend live performances in our own town"* and having the festival *"give locals some entertainment"*. Other impacts in this category include those related to meeting new people and opportunities for social interaction which would result from having an increased number and greater diversity of visitors in the town. Respondents also expected increased opportunities to share time with their families and to host family and friends, believing that the festival *"provides a magnet that brings groups of friends/family of residents to town"*.

There are 13 positive social impacts which group under the dimension of community growth and development. These include wider social benefits to the town and its residents, such as fundraising opportunities, money to the town, a raised profile for the town and the chance to display musical talents and develop new skills. The most common positive social impact expected by respondents in this category is related to positive impacts on local trade. But the way in which local trade would be affected was perceived differently by respondents. Some respondents identified an immediate impact on local trade during the festival weekend, referring to it as *"a 'golden' weekend for traders"* and *"the biggest weekend for the local accommodation, pubs, cafes and restaurants"*. Others referred to the long-term effect of increased trade over the festival weekend, which *"increases the viability of the town's businesses for the whole year"*. Respondents also had high expectations for the role that the festival would play in helping to raise the profile of the town. Comments include: *"it puts our town on the map"*, *"good publicity, greater awareness of the town"*, and *"plenty of visitors to town making it more well known in the state and country"*.

In addition to residents' expectations for social impacts, the questionnaire then asked respondents whether they perceived the expected social impacts to have occurred as a result of the festival. Responses indicate that the majority of residents' expectations for positive social impacts were met. In addition to reporting on which

impacts they perceived to have occurred, respondents provided a number of qualifications and justifications for the occurrence of certain impacts. Table 32 (below) presents the qualified positive impacts that respondents perceived to have occurred as a result of the festival, listed in the first column. The second and third columns headed 'qualified yes' and 'qualified no' represent those respondents who qualified their response as to whether the impacts occurred or not.

Table 32: Qualified Perceptions of Positive Impact Occurrence

PERCEIVED POSITIVE SOCIAL IMPACTS	QUALIFIED RESPONSE	
	Qualified Yes	Qualified No
Community identity and cohesion		
Togetherness within the community	✓	✓
Community ownership of the festival	✓	
Community spirit		✓
Positive cultural impact	✓	✓
Entertainment and socialisation opportunities		
Entertainment opportunities	✓	✓
Opportunities for social interaction	✓	
Brings a small town alive	✓	
Shared family experiences	✓	
A diverse range of visitors attend		✓
Youth-related impacts	✓	
Community growth and development		
Impacts on local trade	✓	
Raises the profile of the town	✓	✓
Money to the community	✓	
Tourism	✓	
Good for the town		✓
Job opportunities	✓	

Respondents who provided a 'qualified yes' felt that in many cases not only had the expected impact occurred, but it had "*even exceeded expectations!*". This was the case for impacts such as 'raising the profile of the town' and 'impacts on local trade'. Conversely, there are other positive impacts which respondents perceived to have occurred; however they occurred at lower levels than expected, for example, "*not as*

much as the town hoped". Respondents used this qualification for impacts related to 'money to the community' and 'impacts on local trade'. Some respondents recognised that the expected positive impacts occurred, but qualified the response with a negative impact. Quotes from respondents included "*Yes, however the event has grown to become a monster"* and "*Yes, however reported drunken youths in the street are a concern"*.

Those who provided a 'qualified no' were communicating that not only did they perceive the expected positives *not* to have occurred, but in fact, they saw the impacts of the festival as being "*more negative than positive"*. A quotation from one respondent who disagreed that the festival was 'good for the town' illustrates this sentiment: *"No. I believe the whole scale of the festival is such that it overwhelms the local community. The anti-social behaviour of the type of visitor attracted creates real problems"*.

4.6.2 Residents' Expectations and Perceptions of Negative Social Impacts

In all 507 people, representing 93% of the total sample, responded to the question which asked them to state what they expected the negative social impacts of the festival to be. In total, there were 41 expected negative social impacts mentioned by respondents. While respondents in Rockford expected all 41 of these to occur as a result of the festival, respondents in Hadley expected only 33 of these negative impacts to result from their festival. Fifty-seven respondents said they expected there to be no negative impacts as a result of the staging of the festival, and 14 people had no expectations at all.

Of the 41 negative social impacts, 20 match up with the negative social impact statements featured in the SIP scale, and there are 21 'community-identified' social impacts that were not included in the SIP scale. All negative social impacts could be grouped under the six dimensions of social impacts, as identified through the earlier factor analysis. The dimensions and negative social impacts are presented in table 33. This table lists the negative social impacts which respondents expected to result from their festival, shown in order of the most frequently mentioned impact to the least mentioned impact in each dimension. It also distinguishes between the impacts

which were previously identified in the SIP scale and those additional 'community-identified' impacts (shown with an asterisk against them).

Table 33: Expectations of Negative Social Impacts

EXPECTED NEGATIVE SOCIAL IMPACTS *	
Inconvenience	***Entertainment and socialisation opportunities – negative***
Increased noise levels	Decline in free street entertainment*
Increased litter	That costs prohibit attendance*
Increased traffic	
Difficulty finding parking	
Crowded streets	***Community growth and development - negative***
Road closures	
Crowding in local facilities	Impacts on local trade
	Strain on local resources*
Community identity and cohesion - negative	Increased price of goods and services
	Tourism*
Negative residents*	
Dissatisfaction with the festivals' organisation*	***Behavioural consequences***
Inappropriate sponsors*	Drinking and its impacts*
Divides the community*	Delinquent behaviour
Worn out volunteers*	Vandalism increased
	Underage drinking
Personal frustration	Crime increased
Disruption to normal routines	The types of visitors attracted*
Frustration with visitors	Increased use of prohibited substances
Reduced access for locals*	Youth-related impacts*
More visitors to the community	Violence*
Impacts on older residents*	Decreased road safety*
Locals take second place to visitors	Lacking police presence
Locals avoided the festival	Bad language*
Frustration with visitor attitudes*	Locals frightened*
People sleeping everywhere*	Family atmosphere reduced*

* Community identified impacts

Seven negative social impacts expected by respondents group under the dimension of inconvenience. Respondents expected an increase in noise, an increase in traffic, difficulties in finding car parking, having roads closed, and having crowded streets

and facilities. An increase in noise was expected by respondents who stated *"extreme loud noise"*, *"the noise after midnight"* and *"crowds of noisy people, noisier 'instruments' (so-called music!)"* as negative impacts. A number of respondents also expected increased litter to occur as a result of the staging of the festival, with concerns related to *"mess and litter in parks and streets"* and *"loads of rubbish, empty bottles, cans etc."*.

Residents expected nine negative social impacts, grouped under the personal frustration dimension. These include impacts that personally affect local residents, in particular relating to their feelings of frustration and disruption caused by having more visitors in their community. Respondents expected the festival to cause disruption to their normal routines, stating that *"the town is too busy for locals to do what they normally do"*, the festival *"interferes with the normal activities of residents"* and *"our normal day-to-day lives and routines are disrupted"*.

There are 14 negative social impacts which group under the dimension of behavioural consequences. These include drinking and its impacts, delinquent behaviour, vandalism, underage drinking and crime, particularly in relation to youth. Of these, the most common negative social impact expected by respondents is related to drinking and its impacts. Respondents showed concern about *"excessive drinking of alcohol in streets, parks and on beaches"* and *"the small minority who overindulge in alcohol then create nuisance and damage"*. Other respondents expected there to be cases of *"delinquent behaviour"* or *"anti-social behaviour"*.

There are a further 11 impacts which group under the dimensions of community identity and cohesion, community growth and development, and entertainment and socialisation opportunities. The data suggests that these dimensions have both positive and negative qualities. That is, there are impacts that can diminish, or have negative impacts on the areas of identity and cohesion, community growth and development, and entertainment and socialisation opportunities. For example, having residents who are negative about the festival, inappropriate sponsors and dissatisfaction with the organisation of the festival are impacts which negatively affect a community's identity and cohesion.

Four impacts that were perceived as positive social impacts ('tourism', 'youth-related impacts', 'impacts on local trade' and 'more visitors to the community') were also perceived to have negative impacts by some respondents. For example, respondents expected 'impacts on local trade' to be negative, referring to "*outside traders taking potential revenue from the town*" and recognising that "*some business people were the losers in trade while others made a good profit, mainly food, drink and fuel*". For some respondents, having "*lots of people*" and "*many more people in town*" were perceived to be a negative impact, given that increased visitors are a cause of resident frustration and a source of disruption to their everyday lives.

In addition to residents' expectations for negative social impacts, the questionnaire then asked respondents whether they perceived the expected impacts to have occurred. Responses indicate that the majority of residents perceived the expected negative social impacts to have occurred; however again many of these responses were qualified, as respondents justified the occurrence of the negative impacts. The negative impacts that respondents perceived to have occurred as a result of the festival, and for which a qualified response was given, are shown below in the first column of table 34. The second and third columns headed 'qualified yes' and 'qualified no' represent those respondents who felt they needed to qualify their response as to whether the impacts occurred or not.

Table 34: Qualified Perceptions of Negative Impact Occurrence

PERCEIVED NEGATIVE SOCIAL IMPACTS	QUALIFIED RESPONSE	
	Qualified Yes	Qualified No
Inconvenience		
Increased noise levels	✓	✓
Increased litter	✓	✓
Increased traffic	✓	
Difficulty finding parking	✓	
Crowded streets	✓	
Road closures	✓	
Crowding in local facilities	✓	
Community identity and cohesion - negative		
Negative residents	✓	
Worn-out volunteers	✓	
Personal frustration		
Disruption to normal routines	✓	
Frustration with visitors	✓	✓
Reduced access for locals	✓	
More visitors to the community	✓	
Locals avoided the festival	✓	
Frustration with visitor attitudes	✓	
Community growth and development - negative		
Strain on local resources	✓	
Tourism	✓	
Behavioural consequences		
Drinking and its impacts	✓	✓
Delinquent behaviour	✓	✓
Vandalism increased	✓	✓
Underage drinking	✓	✓
Crime increased	✓	✓
The types of visitors attracted	✓	✓
Increased use of prohibited substances	✓	✓
Violence	✓	✓
Family atmosphere reduced	✓	

In particular, for negative impacts related to inconvenience and behavioural consequences, there are a significant number of impacts for which respondents have

provided a 'qualified yes' response. The 'qualified yes' responses say that the expected negative impacts occurred but: *"they were minimal"*; *"they are under control"*; *"they can be tolerated"*; *"they can be managed"* and *"they didn't worry me personally"*. Essentially respondents were saying that there were negative impacts but they were tolerated for a variety of reasons. Conversely, there were cases in which respondents felt the negative impacts had a *"particularly significant effect on them"* and some who stated that the negative impacts were *"worse than expected"*. In general, these qualifications related to the behavioural consequences such as underage drinking and delinquent behaviour.

Those who provided a 'qualified no' were communicating that not only did they perceive the expected negatives *not* to have occurred as a result of the festival, they felt they didn't occur because they had *"gotten them under control"*.

4.7 Cluster Analysis

In order to identify the subgroups within a community who felt differently about the festival, cluster analysis using a two-step method was undertaken on a range of demographic and behavioural variables. Two-, three-, four- and five-cluster solutions were examined, with the five-cluster solution chosen as the most appropriate, given that it best differentiated the overall sample of respondents.

4.7.1 Profiling the Clusters

Profiling the cluster solution involves describing the characteristics of each cluster based on the range of variables used in the clustering process. The profile of each cluster was compared through cross-tabulations. The chi-square statistic was used to determine significant differences between the clusters based on the range of demographic and behavioural variables.

Five distinct clusters were identified. As 18% of the respondents (n=98) were eliminated from the cluster analysis due to missing values, the cluster analysis reflects 82% of respondents (n=446). The profiles of the five clusters across each of

the demographic and behavioural clustering variables are presented below in table 35.

Table 35: Cluster Profiles on Demographic Clustering Variables (n = 446)

	Cluster 1 (*n* = 115)	Cluster 2 (*n* = 56)	Cluster 3 (*n* = 115)	Cluster 4 (*n* = 78)	Cluster 5 (*n* = 82)	χ^2
Age						248.670*
Under 24	0%	0%	1.7%	3.8%	3.7%	
25 – 34	0%	3.6%	4.3%	1.3%	6.1%	
35 – 44	0%	7.1%	28.7%	7.7%	24.4%	
45 – 54	0.9%	35.7%	45.2%	19.2%	26.8%	
55 – 64	36.5%	35.7%	18.3%	26.9%	32.9%	
65 – 74	41.7%	16.1%	1.7%	25.6%	3.7%	
75+	20.9%	1.8%	0%	15.4%	2.4%	
Education						60.420*
No formal qualifications	3.5%	0%	2.6%	2.6%	0%	
Year 10 or equivalent	10.4%	10.7%	15.7%	23.1%	9.8%	
Year 12 or equivalent	13.0%	26.8%	9.6%	20.5%	13.4%	
Undergraduate degree	34.8%	17.9%	19.1%	15.4%	17.1%	
Postgraduate degree	21.7%	16.1%	31.3%	14.1%	18.3%	
TAFE qualification	13.0%	16.1%	11.3%	11.5%	34.1%	
Trade qualification	3.5%	12.5%	10.4%	12.8%	7.3%	
Employment						258.870*
Full-time employment	0.9%	21.4%	34.8%	17.9%	30.5%	
Part-time employment	5.2%	8.9%	19.1%	9.0%	23.2%	
Self-employed	7.0%	46.4%	32.2%	9.0%	18.3%	
Unemployed	0.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.3%	0%	
Retired	83.5%	16.1%	1.7%	55.1%	20.7%	
Student	0%	0%	0.9%	1.3%	1.2%	
Home duties	2.6%	1.8%	9.6%	5.1%	6.1%	
Casual employment	0%	3.6%	0%	1.3%	0%	
Occupation						115.976*
Manager/administrator	29.6%	41.1%	10.4%	19.2%	31.7%	
Professional	60.0%	28.6%	51.3%	28.2%	42.7%	
Tradesperson or related	1.7%	1.8%	12.2%	14.1%	7.3%	
Clerical worker	7.0%	1.8%	9.6%	17.9%	7.3%	
Service worker	0%	26.8%	7.8%	5.1%	7.3%	
Production worker	1.7%	0%	1.7%	5.1%	2.4%	
Labourer or related	0%	0%	5.2%	5.1%	0%	
Student	0%	0%	0.9%	1.3%	1.2%	
Home duties	0%	0%	0.9%	3.8%	0%	
Income						84.406*
Prefer not to say	28.7%	16.1%	22.6%	48.7%	22.0%	
Less than $20,000	7.0%	21.4%	10.4%	14.1%	7.3%	
$20,000 - $39,999	30.4%	26.8%	9.6%	10.3%	23.2%	
$40,000 - $59,999	20.0%	10.7%	13.9%	7.7%	18.3%	

$60,000 - $79,999	2.6%	14.3%	13.0%	9.0%	7.3%	
$80,000 - $99,999	6.1%	3.6%	8.7%	5.1%	15.9%	
Over $100,000	5.2%	7.1%	21.7%	5.1%	6.1%	
Years of Residence						100.779*
1 – 5	29.6%	39.3%	20.9%	2.6%	14.6%	
6 – 10	20.0%	7.1%	33.0%	24.4%	26.8%	
11 – 20	25.2%	19.6%	28.7%	20.5%	31.7%	
21 – 30	16.5%	16.1%	9.6%	15.4%	15.9%	
31 – 40	6.1%	0%	7.0%	9.0%	6.1%	
41+	2.6%	17.9%	0.9%	28.2%	4.9%	
Volunteered at the festival						360.657*
Yes	3.5%	14.3%	1.7%	2.6%	100.0%	
No	96.5%	85.7%	98.3%	97.4%	0%	
Work in tourism						82.437*
Yes	11.3%	62.5%	9.6%	12.8%	18.3%	
No	88.7%	37.5%	90.4%	87.2%	81.7%	
Paid work on weekend of festival						127.896*
Yes	0%	51.8%	10.4%	0%	6.1%	
No	100.0%	48.2%	89.6%	100.0%	93.9%	
Feelings about the festival						253.070*
Love it and hope it continues	27.0%	39.3%	75.7%	2.6%	76.8%	
Tolerate it because I think it is good for the community	56.5%	33.9%	20.0%	20.5%	20.7%	
Adjust my lifestyle during the weekend	3.5%	10.7%	2.6%	25.6%	2.4%	
Stay away from the area	13.0%	8.9%	1.7%	26.9%	0%	
Dislike it and would be happier if it didn't continue	0%	7.1%	0%	24.4%	0%	
Interest and support						230.721*
Interested in music and happy that the festival takes place	79.1%	55.4%	93.0%	14.1%	90.2%	
Interested in music but not happy that the festival takes place	0%	17.8%	0.9%	52.6%	0%	
Not interested in music but happy that the festival takes place	20.9%	25.0%	6.1%	17.9%	9.8%	
Not interested in music and not happy that the festival takes place	0%	1.8%	0%	15.4%	0%	
Activities on festival weekend						514.161*
Volunteered at the festival	0%	12.5%	1.7%	0%	91.6%	
Attended the festival	26.9%	30.4%	79.2%	16.7%	5.6%	
Didn't attend the festival	47.0%	1.8%	10.4%	53.8%	0%	
Working	2.6%	46.4%	1.7%	2.6%	2.8%	
Left town	11.3%	1.8%	3.5%	20.5%	0%	
Other	12.2%	7.1%	3.5%	6.4%	0%	

* Significant at the 5% level

4.7.2 Interpreting the Clusters

Profiled above are the five distinct community subgroups identified on the basis of a range of demographic and behavioural variables. Whilst these profiles describe each cluster on the entire range of clustering variables, what is important is to identify "how important the different variables are for the formation of the cluster" (Norusis, 2006, p. 385). This is important for accurate interpretation of the clusters, which involves examining the most important variables in each cluster and using these "to name or assign a label accurately describing the nature of the clusters" (Hair et al., 1998, p. 500).

SPSS produces clusterwise importance plots which illustrate for each cluster the relative importance of each of the clustering variables in differentiating that cluster from any other (Garson, 2004a). The variables which best differentiated each cluster are shown in tables 36 to 40 below. It was these key variables that were used in the naming and interpretation of each of the five clusters, labelled as 'tolerators', 'economically connected', 'attendees', 'avoiders' and 'volunteers' respectively.

Tolerators (Cluster 1)

The variables which best differentiated Cluster 1 are shown in table 36 below. These key variables suggested the name 'tolerators' for Cluster 1, which accounts for 25.8% of the sample, given that this cluster is distinct from all others based on the feelings that its members have towards the festival. This cluster is characterised by residents who were tolerant of the festival taking place in their community. Two of the key demographic characteristics which set this cluster apart from the others are the age and employment status of its members. This cluster is clearly the oldest cluster with 99.1% of its members aged over 55 years, and it has the greatest number of retirees of any cluster. What also stands out about this cluster is that in terms of their activities undertaken on the festival weekend, whilst the largest proportion of this cluster did not attend the festival, there was still a smaller proportion who did. Even though the majority did not attend, no-one in this cluster disliked the festival, and everyone was happy for it to take place in their community. Whilst a large majority had an interest in music, a sizeable percentage had no interest in the theme but were still happy for the festival to take place. This explains the majority

response of people who tolerated the festival because overall they thought it was beneficial for the community.

Table 36: Key Variables Differentiating Cluster 1

KEY VARIABLES	TOLERATORS (CLUSTER 1)
Feeling towards the festival	Tolerate the festival because of the benefits to the wider community.
Age	Oldest cluster.
Employment	Large majority retired.
Weekend activity	Most didn't attend, however small proportion did.
Interest in and support for festival	Are mostly interested in the theme and all are happy for the festival to take place in their community.

Economically Connected (Cluster 2)

The most important variables differentiating Cluster 2 from all other clusters are shown below in table 37. Members of the second cluster account for 12.6% of the sample and consist of residents who were economically connected to the festival. The distinguishing feature which sets this cluster apart from the others is that its members are those who worked in tourism and who undertook paid work on the weekend of the festival. Whilst a significant proportion of this cluster also attended the festival, most of this cluster were working over the festival weekend. It was on the basis of these key characteristics that this cluster has been labelled as 'economically connected'. Distinguishing demographic features of this cluster relate to employment, occupation and length of residence in the community. Most of this cluster were self-employed and were engaged in either managerial/administration occupations, service industry or professional occupations. Residents in this cluster represented the extremes of length of residence, with significant proportions new to the community, but also a sizeable group who had lived in the community for 41 years or more.

Table 37: Key Variables Differentiating Cluster 2

KEY VARIABLES	ECONOMICALLY CONNECTED (CLUSTER 2)
Weekend activity	Were working.
Paid work during the festival weekend	Majority undertook paid work on the weekend of the festival.
Work in tourism	Majority work in tourism.
Occupation	Managerial/administration, service industry or professional occupations.
Employment	Most are self-employed.
Years of residence	Significant proportion living there 1-5 years, but also 41 years or more.

Attendees (Cluster 3)

Table 38 (below) outlines the key variables which make this cluster distinct from the others. Most important, and therefore used in the labelling of Cluster 3 as the 'attendees', accounting for 25.8% of the sample, is that this cluster is made up of those residents who attended the festival. Also differentiating this from other clusters are the demographic variables related to age, employment and income. Demographically distinct from all other clusters, the attendees represent the youngest cluster, and that which earned the highest incomes. The majority of this cluster were in full-time employment, with a significant number of self-employed persons. In terms of their feelings towards the festival, the large majority of the attendees loved the festival and hoped that it continues. No-one in this cluster disliked the festival, and less than one percent were not happy that the festival took place. The large majority of attendees showed an interest in the theme and were happy that the festival took place in their community. Also important in distinguishing this from other clusters is the fact that of all clusters, the attendees have the smallest percentage of people who volunteered for the festival.

Table 38: Key Variables Differentiating Cluster 3

KEY VARIABLES	ATTENDEES (CLUSTER 3)
Weekend activity	Attended the festival.
Age	Youngest cluster.
Employment	Majority in full-time employment or self-employed.
Feeling towards the festival	Love the festival and hope that it continues.
Volunteered for the festival	The smallest percentage of people who volunteer for the festival.
Interest in and support for festival	Majority show an interest in the theme and are happy that the festival takes place.
Income	High income earners.

Avoiders (Cluster 4)

Members of the fourth cluster account for 17.5% of the sample and consist of residents who were unhappy that the festival took place in their community and who avoided it by either not attending or leaving town. The other important variables differentiating this cluster from the rest are shown below in table 39. Whilst the majority of this cluster were actually interested in music, they were not happy that the festival took place in their community. Of all the clusters, this cluster has the largest percentage of people who disliked the festival and would be happier if it did not continue, and the smallest percentage who loved the festival and wanted it to continue. There are also significant numbers of people who either stayed away from the area or adjusted their lifestyle in some way because of the festival. The majority of this cluster did not attend the festival and a sizeable proportion left town for the weekend. No-one from this cluster undertook any paid work on the weekend of the festival, indicating there was no economic relationship with the festival. Key demographic characteristics which differentiate this cluster from the others are the occupation and annual household income of cluster members. Importantly in relation to occupation, this cluster represents a mix of occupations including professional, managerial/administration, clerical and trade work. In terms of income, this cluster is different from the others in that it is this cluster that was least likely to provide their level of income. Most people in this cluster preferred not to say, which could indicate that members of this cluster earned either quite low or quite high

incomes. From those who did respond, the largest group earned less than $20,000 annually. Also significant is that this cluster is made up of the long-term residents who have lived in their community for over 41 years.

Table 39: Key Variables Differentiating Cluster 4

KEY VARIABLES	AVOIDERS (CLUSTER 4)
Interest in and support for festival	Majority are interested in music but are not happy that the festival takes place in their community.
Feeling towards the festival	Dislike the festival, stay away or adjust their lifestyle.
Weekend activity	Majority didn't attend the festival and a sizeable proportion left town for the weekend.
Years of residence	Mostly long-term residents, 41 years or more.
Occupation	Mix of professional, managerial/administration, clerical and trade occupations.
Income	Most people preferred not to reveal their income.
Paid work during the festival weekend	No-one undertook any paid work on festival weekend.

Volunteers (Cluster 5)

The most important variables which distinguish this cluster from the others are shown in table 40 (below). Most important, and therefore used in naming Cluster 5 the 'volunteers', accounting for 18.4% of the sample, is that this cluster is made up of residents who volunteered for their festival. 100% of people in this cluster volunteered for their festival, which could have been prior to, during or following the weekend of the festival. On the actual weekend, whilst the large majority volunteered at the festival, the remainder of this cluster attended or worked. No-one in this cluster did not attend the festival or left town for the weekend. This cluster has the largest percentage of people who loved the festival and hoped it continues. No-one in this cluster disliked the festival or stayed away from the area, and everyone was happy for it to take place in their community. This cluster also showed a strong interest in the theme. Demographically, this cluster is distinct from the others in that it has the widest age range, with members ranging from 35-64. The volunteers cluster also has the highest level of TAFE education and a mix of full-time and part-time employment.

Table 40: Key Variables Differentiating Cluster 5

KEY VARIABLES	VOLUNTEERS (CLUSTER 5)
Volunteered for the festival	Entire cluster volunteered for the festival.
Weekend activity	Large majority volunteered at the festival.
Feeling towards the festival	Love it and hope it continues.
Age	Widest age range from 35-64 years.
Interest in and support for festival	Majority show an interest in the theme and all are happy for the festival to take place.
Education	TAFE education.
Employment	Full-time and part-time employment.

4.7.3 Validating the Cluster Solution

In order to validate the five-cluster solution, separate cluster analyses were run on the Hadley and Rockford data sets separately. It was found that a five-cluster solution was most appropriate in both Hadley and Rockford, and although the resultant cluster profiles were very similar, the size of the clusters and the order in which they appeared differed slightly in each community. A chi-square test was therefore used to investigate whether this relationship between cluster membership and community is significant. That is, does cluster membership differ significantly with respect to the community in which respondents live?

The results of the chi-square test reveal significant differences in cluster membership by community, as shown in table 41 below. Significant differences can be observed regarding the order in which the clusters appeared in each community. Hadley has the greatest number of attendees (n = 65), followed closely by volunteers (n = 56). There are then equal numbers of economically connected and avoiders (n = 33), and the smallest number, tolerators (n = 29). Rockford shows quite a different pattern, with the greatest number of tolerators (n = 86), followed by attendees (n = 50), avoiders (n = 45) and smaller numbers of volunteers (n = 26) and residents who are economically connected to the festival (n = 23).

Table 41: Cluster Membership by Community

	Tolerators	Economically Connected	Attendees	Avoiders	Volunteers	Total
Hadley	29	33	65	33	56	216
Rockford	86	23	50	45	26	230
Total	115	56	115	78	82	446

$\chi^2 = 44.420$, df = 4, p = .000

4.7.4 Cluster Perceptions of Social Impacts

ANOVA testing was used to compare the resulting five clusters based on their perceptions of the social impacts of a festival, and significant differences were identified. The mean responses for the five clusters on each social impact variable are presented in appendix 8. Thirty-eight out of 41 social impact items show significant differences in the mean scores between the five clusters. The three impacts for which mean scores between the five clusters are not significantly different are increased price of goods and services ($F = 1.379$, $p > 0.05$), increased use of prohibited substances ($F = 1.983$, $p > 0.05$) and underage drinking ($F = 2.313$, $p > 0.05$). This indicates that the five clusters did not hold significantly different perceptions of these impacts. An examination of the values of the F statistic for the remainder of impact items shows those which have the greatest differences between clusters. Whether the festival provided cultural experiences ($F = 38.288$, $p < 0.05$), a positive cultural impact ($F = 34.066$, $p < 0.05$), togetherness within the community ($F = 33.440$, $p < 0.05$), increased pride in the town ($F = 30.797$, $p < 0.05$) and opportunities for social interaction ($F = 27.502$, $p < 0.05$), and whether residents enjoyed having visitors during the festival ($F = 26.180$, $p < 0.05$) are the impacts which have the greatest differences in means between the clusters. This indicates that the five clusters held significantly different perceptions of these impacts.

Whilst the above examines which individual impact items were perceived most differently by the five clusters, it is necessary to gain a broader picture of the overall differences in perceptions of impacts for each cluster. This is achieved by examining

the number of impacts rated positively and the number rated negatively by each cluster. These figures are shown in table 42 below.

Table 42: Number of Impacts Rated Positively and Negatively by Each Cluster

IMPACT RATING	Tolerators	Economically Connected	Attendees	Avoiders	Volunteers
Positive	28	24	27	9	30
Negative	13	17	14	32	11

From the overall pattern of mean responses for each cluster presented in appendix 8 and the number of impacts rated as positive or negative in table 42 above, obvious patterns of response can be identified. The following basic profiles for each cluster can be developed to explain how they differ in their perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.

The 'avoiders' are clearly the most negative, having assigned the highest negative impact ratings of any cluster and having seen the majority of impacts as being negative in nature. The items which this cluster thought had the greatest negative impacts were underage drinking, vandalism, noise, crime and increased use of prohibited substances. Only 9 out of 41 impacts were rated as positive, with each rated less than a very small positive impact. The impacts which this cluster acknowledged as being positive include increased trade, the opportunity to host family and friends, entertainment opportunities and community groups working together.

At the other end of the scale, the volunteers represent the most positive group having perceived 30 of the social impacts resulting from the festival to be positive, and having assigned the highest positive impact ratings of any cluster. The volunteers saw the greatest positive impacts as there having been more visitors to the community, entertainment opportunities, fundraising opportunities, increased trade and community groups working together, and an image to encourage tourism created.

Whilst the volunteers and avoiders are extreme clusters, and directly opposite to each other, the tolerators, economically connected and attendees clusters are less extreme. In regard to the number of impacts rated positively and negatively, these three clusters show quite similar patterns in that they recognised a mix of both positive and negative impacts resulting from a festival. Therefore, further examination of the ratings assigned to these impacts is necessary to better distinguish between the tolerators, economically connected and attendees clusters. These ratings are shown in table 43 below. The first column lists the six impact dimensions, and the second column presents the mean impact ratings assigned to these dimensions by each of the five clusters. The figures in column two are an average of the impact ratings for the individual items that make up each dimension. Using these figures, the clusters can now be compared.

Table 43: Mean Impact Level for Each Factor by Cluster

	CLUSTER MEAN LEVEL IMPACT [ab]				
DIMENSION	**Tolerators**	**Economically Connected**	**Attendees**	**Avoiders**	**Volunteers**
Inconvenience	-0.2	-1.3	-0.4	-2.4	+0.2
Community Identity and Cohesion	+2.6	+1.6	+2.7	-0.9	+3.0
Personal Frustration	-0.4	-0.7	0.0	-2.2	+0.1
Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities	+2.8	+2.1	+3.1	+0.1	+3.2
Community Growth and Development	+2.3	+1.8	+2.7	+0.1	+3.0
Behavioural Consequences	-1.0	-2.2	-1.7	-2.8	-1.4

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

In examining the strength of the ratings assigned to the impacts, as shown in table 43 above, the economically connected cluster can be seen as the second most negative cluster. The difference between the avoiders and the economically connected clusters is in their rating of the negative impacts. Where the avoiders saw the majority of impacts as negative, and quite large negative impacts, the economically

connected cluster rated the negatives lower, and acknowledged more of the positive impacts. Whilst this cluster rated the behavioural consequences and inconvenience impacts similarly to the avoiders, they rated the personal frustration impacts much lower. They also recognised many more of the positive impacts such as entertainment opportunities, more visitors to the community and increased trade at much higher levels of positive impact than did the avoiders.

This leaves the tolerators and the attendees as the two most similar clusters in terms of their perceptions of impacts. These two clusters sit in between the positive and negative extremes of the volunteers and avoiders respectively, and show more of a balance on their perceptions and ratings of positive and negative impacts. Whilst the tolerators and the attendees have almost identical numbers of impacts rated positively and negatively, there are slight differences in the strength of the ratings of these impacts. The attendees tended to rate the positive impacts slightly higher than the tolerators; however these two clusters shared the view that more visitors to the community, entertainment opportunities and increased trade were the most positive impacts resulting from a festival. In the majority of cases, the attendees also tended to rate the negative impacts higher than the tolerators; however both clusters rated delinquent behaviour and underage drinking as the greatest negative impacts of the festival.

Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons

Following ANOVA testing, Tukey's post hoc tests were conducted to identify which clusters were significantly different from other clusters based on their perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. While post hoc tests were run on each of the individual impact items, it was found that the statistically significant differences on the individual items making up a dimension showed some similarities. Therefore, for ease of discussion, the individual impact items have been grouped into their impact dimensions. Presented in appendices 9-15 are the post hoc test results for each individual impact item, grouped by dimension. Appendix 9 contains the post-hoc results for each impact making up the inconvenience dimension; appendix 10 presents the post-hoc results for each impact making up the community identity and cohesion dimension, and so on for each of the remaining dimensions of personal

frustration (appendix 11), entertainment and socialisation opportunities (appendix 12), community growth and development (appendix 13), behavioural consequences (appendix 14), and miscellaneous impacts (appendix 15). The significant differences between the clusters will now be discussed for each of the dimensions in turn.

Inconvenience

Statistically significant differences were identified between the avoiders and the tolerators, attendees and volunteers clusters in relation to inconvenience impacts. The post hoc tests show that the avoiders held strongly negative perceptions of traffic, parking issues, noise levels, crowding in local facilities, crowded streets, litter and road closures. These strong negative views are significantly different to the small negative, or sometimes small positive views held by the tolerators, attendees and volunteers clusters in relation to inconvenience impacts.

Community Identity and Cohesion

The avoiders displayed a statistically significant difference from all other clusters on the range of community identity and cohesion impacts. While the tolerators, economically connected, attendees and volunteers perceived the impacts on community identity and cohesion, including increased pride in the town, community ownership of the festival and togetherness within the community, as positive impacts, the avoiders perceived these to be negative.

Personal Frustration

In identifying statistically significant differences between the clusters based on personal frustration impacts, it is again the avoiders cluster which is significantly different from a range of other clusters. The avoiders have strong negative perceptions of the personal frustration impacts, whereas the remaining four clusters have given only small negative or neutral impact ratings.

Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities

The avoiders were found to be statistically significantly different from every other cluster in terms of their perceptions of the entertainment and socialisation opportunities. For each impact, the avoiders have given small negative, neutral or small positive ratings in comparison to the large positive impact ratings given by all other clusters.

The post hoc tests also indicate that the economically connected cluster is statistically significantly different from the attendees and volunteers regarding entertainment and socialisation opportunities. Although the economically connected cluster was positive, they were much less positive than the attendees and volunteers who gave the largest positive ratings for these impacts.

Community Growth and Development

The avoiders display a statistically significant difference from all other clusters on the range of community growth and development impacts. Where all other clusters have given strong positive impact ratings, especially the volunteers, the avoiders have given negative, neutral or only small positive ratings.

A further source of statistically significant differences exists between the economically connected cluster and the volunteers related to community growth and development impacts. Although the economically connected cluster perceived these impacts to be positive, their rating is the lowest compared to the volunteers who have the highest positive ratings.

Behavioural Consequences

Regarding behavioural consequences, the avoiders are significantly different from the tolerators and volunteers clusters. The post hoc tests indicate that the avoiders perceived much greater levels of negative impact from the behavioural consequences such as vandalism and delinquent behaviour than did either the tolerators or volunteers who assigned small negative impact ratings.

Miscellaneous Impacts

Statistically significant differences can be identified between the avoiders and all other clusters in relation to the miscellaneous impacts of increased trade and a larger range of goods and services available. For increased trade, whilst the avoiders perceived this as a very small positive impact, all other clusters have provided large positive ratings. Related to having a larger range of goods and services available, only the avoiders perceived this to be a negative, with all other clusters rating this as a positive impact.

Tukey's post hoc tests further indicated statistically significant differences between the avoiders and the tolerators, attendees and volunteers in relation to the level of police presence and increased crime. Regarding whether there were adequate levels of police presence, the avoiders' small negative rating is significantly different from the positive ratings given by the tolerators, attendees and volunteers. For increased crime, whilst all the clusters perceived this to be a negative impact, the avoiders provided a much higher negative rating than the tolerators, attendees and volunteers.

In summary, this discussion has highlighted which clusters are different from other clusters on their perceptions of the social impacts, grouped under the six impact dimensions. Across each of the dimensions, the avoiders were most often different from the tolerators, attendees and volunteers and, at times, the economically connected cluster too. The avoiders held the most negative perceptions of impacts across the dimensions, while the tolerators, attendees and volunteers held the more positive perceptions and ratings of impacts. The economically connected cluster was typically less negative than the avoiders, but less positive than the tolerators, attendees and volunteers.

4.8 Summary

This chapter has presented a combination of both qualitative and quantitative data gathered through the residents' perceptions questionnaire related to answering the overall research question 'what is the social impact of festivals on communities?'. More specifically, this chapter has addressed a number of sub-questions, providing a discussion of the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals; a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival; the distinct subgroups within a community who felt differently about a festival; and the different perceptions of social impacts held by these subgroups.

Factor analysis identified inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences as the six underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals. The qualitative data on residents' expectations of social impacts served to support these six dimensions, showing that

all the impacts which respondents listed unprompted fit into these previously defined dimensions. This expectations data further provided a set of additional 'community-identified' impacts, which help to expand the inventory of positive and negative social impacts resulting from community festivals.

Residents' perceptions of the social impacts of their festival were examined for both Hadley and Rockford individually. This showed the impacts which residents perceived to have occurred as a result of their festival and also the impacts which they perceived not to have occurred. These impacts were then rated as either positive or negative in nature along the -5 to +5 scale. A comparison of residents' perceptions of the social impacts across the two communities revealed that whilst respondents in both Hadley and Rockford perceived the occurrence of certain impacts differently, they were quite similar in their ratings of these impacts as either positive or negative in nature. The qualitative responses again provided additional support for, and aided in the interpretation of the quantitative data. The open-ended questions allowed respondents to express a qualified perception response, in which a number of exceptions and justifications were provided in addition to their responses on whether an impact occurred or not. These qualifications helped to further explain residents' perceptions of the positive and negative social impacts of community festivals.

A cluster analysis identified the tolerators, economically connected, attendees, avoiders and volunteers as five distinct community subgroups who each felt differently about a festival. These clusters are distinct on a range of demographic and behavioural variables, and each held different perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. The avoiders are the most negative in their perceptions of impacts and the volunteers are the most positive. In between, towards the negative end of the scale is the economically connected cluster, who are less negative than the avoiders, given that they recognised some of the positive impacts too. The attendees and tolerators clusters are quite similar in their perceptions in that they recognised both the positive and negative impacts. The positives were rated quite highly, although not as high as the volunteers had rated them, while the negatives were rated relatively low compared to the economically connected and avoiders clusters' ratings.

Chapter 5 will now present a discussion of these results in relation to how they answer the key research questions of the study.

CHAPTER 5:

DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the results, presented previously in chapter 4, in relation to how they answer the key research questions outlined below:

1. What are the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals?
2. What are a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival?
3. Are there distinct subgroups within a community who differ in their feelings towards a festival?
4. Do these subgroups hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals?
5. Can the SIP scale be used to measure residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals?

The first section presents discussion of the findings related to identifying the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals. Second, this chapter examines the key findings on a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival. Third, the findings on distinct subgroups within a community are discussed, and fourth, this chapter considers the findings on whether these subgroups hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. Finally, this chapter discusses the SIP scale as a tool to measure residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.

5.2 What are the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals?

This research aimed to understand the social impact of festivals on communities and, in doing so, sought to identify the underlying set of dimensions which summarise the social impacts of community festivals. Factor analysis identified six underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals: inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences, as presented in section 4.4.

These six factors have been compared to the factors identified by Delamere (2001) and Fredline et al. (2003), given that each of these studies was also on the social impacts of festivals and/or events. These comparisons are presented in table 44 and the similarities between the identified factors are discussed below. Column one lists the six factors identified in the current research. For each of these factors, column two lists the factors identified in previous research by Delamere (2001) and Fredline et al. (2003) which exhibit some similarities.

Table 44: Factor Comparisons

FACTOR	SIMILAR FACTORS IN PREVIOUS STUDIES
Inconvenience	Social costs (Delamere, 2001); Concerns about justice and inconvenience (Fredline et al., 2003)
Community identity and cohesion	Community benefits (Delamere, 2001)
Personal frustration	Social costs (Delamere, 2001)
Entertainment and socialisation opportunities	Social and economic development benefits (Fredline et al., 2003)
Community growth and development	Individual benefits (Delamere, 2001)
Behavioural consequences	Impacts on behaviour and environment (Fredline et al., 2003)

Factor 1, ‘inconvenience’, represents the issues that arise from the hosting of a festival which serve to inconvenience members of the local population. Local residents experience this inconvenience when they face increased traffic, road closures and redirections. They also experience it when they have difficulty finding a car park and when their footpaths, shops and facilities are crowded. The idea of a set of impacts resulting from a festival which inconveniences local residents is not new. This factor has similarities with Delamere’s (2001) ‘social costs’ factor and Fredline et al.’s (2003) factor termed ‘concerns about justice and inconvenience’. Each of these factors also recognises the inconvenience that residents experience caused by issues such as overcrowding, traffic, litter and noise, which arise as a result of hosting a festival.

Factor 2, ‘community identity and cohesion’, represents a combination of outcomes of the festival which have an impact on the sense of community identity and cohesion felt by community members. By hosting the festival, the community is able to show others how it is unique and special, and the festival assists the community to develop an image to encourage tourism to the region. Where community members feel a sense of ownership and pride in the festival, the successful hosting of the festival can lead to increased feelings of community togetherness and a sense of identity. This idea is reflected in Delamere’s (2001) social benefits sub-factor ‘community benefits’, which comprises items related to community image and identity.

The third factor, ‘personal frustration’, explains the frustration felt by residents as a result of having more visitors in their community, and their feeling of taking second place to these visitors. This is what causes local residents to avoid the attractions at the festival, since they feel the attractions are catering mostly to the visitor anyway. Residents also become frustrated because their everyday routines are disrupted by the presence and activities of visitors in their community. Delamere’s (2001) factor termed ‘social costs’ is similar to the personal frustration factor in that it also reflects the disruption and intrusion into the lives of local residents caused by the presence of increased visitors.

Factor 4, 'entertainment and socialisation opportunities', identifies the opportunities for entertainment and socialisation gained by residents as a result of hosting a festival. These opportunities include not only meeting new people and interacting on a social level, but also having opportunities for interacting and sharing experiences with family members and being able to host family and friends during the festival. There are similarities between the 'entertainment and socialisation opportunities' factor and the social items contained in Fredline et al.'s (2003) 'social and economic development benefits' factor, including meeting new people, having increased entertainment opportunities, and a chance to have fun with friends and family.

The fifth factor, 'community growth and development', summarises the opportunities provided to the community for its growth and development that occur as a direct result of staging a festival. Community members who are involved with the organisation and staging of the festival are able to develop new skills, and many locals have the opportunity to display their musical talents at the festival. Other members of the community may benefit from job opportunities arising as a result of the increased business generated by the festival, such as additional staff needed in local restaurants and cafés, retail shops and accommodation providers. As a whole, the community can grow and develop itself by encouraging community groups to work together to stage the festival and taking advantage of fundraising opportunities arising out of the festival. There is a small similarity between factor 5, 'community growth and development', and what Delamere (2001) refers to as 'individual benefits'. This is the second of Delamere's social benefits sub-factors, which identifies the opportunities for community members to learn and develop new skills and talents as a result of a festival. Whilst similar impacts comprise the 'community growth and development' factor, this factor encompasses not only the skill development of individual community members, but also views this as contributing to the overall development and growth of the wider community.

Factor 6, 'behavioural consequences', recognises the issues such as underage drinking, delinquent behaviour and vandalism perceived as the behavioural consequences which can occur at a festival. This factor exhibits a likeness to Fredline et al.'s (2003) 'impacts on behaviour and environment' factor, which also

comprises items related to excessive drinking and drug use, rowdy and delinquent behaviour, and crime.

In all, the six factors identified in this research exhibit greater similarities with the factors proposed by Delamere (2001) and less with the factors identified by Fredline et al. (2003). One reason for this may be that Delamere's (2001) research focuses on the social impacts of community-based festivals, whereas Fredline et al.'s (2003) focus is on medium- to large-scale events. Three factors which have parallels only with Delamere's (2001) study are 'community identity and cohesion', 'personal frustration' and 'community growth and development'. This finding suggests that impacts are linked to the size of a festival, and that certain types of impacts are more likely to result from community festivals rather than larger sized events.

The sense of 'community identity and cohesion' is one of the categories of impacts that are more likely to result from a small community festival. This is because there are greater opportunities for the community to have feelings of ownership and pride through their direct participation in the festival. This may not be the same for larger sized events where the community is not as directly involved in the organisation and delivery of the event. Similarly 'community growth and development' impacts, such as skills development and fundraising opportunities for local community groups, may not be found in larger events where a professional event management team is employed. Therefore, smaller festivals, through their volunteer and community involvement, offer greater opportunities for engagement that result in enhanced community identity, bonding of the community, and community growth and development outcomes for members of the local population. 'Personal frustration' may also be specific to community festivals rather than larger sized events, simply because the festival takes place in a smaller location over a short period of time, and therefore creates more intense impacts.

Whilst the research suggests that 'community identity and cohesion', 'personal frustration' and 'community growth and development' are impacts that are more likely to result from community festivals rather than larger sized events, there are also some similarities in the types of social impacts that may result from events, regardless of their size. These include the dimensions of 'inconvenience',

'entertainment and socialisation opportunities' and 'behavioural consequences' that have parallels in Fredline et al.'s (2003) research on medium- to large-sized events. This suggests that certain impacts are equally likely to result from an event, regardless of its size. For example any event, by its very nature, should provide opportunities for entertainment and socialisation. Also, as any event is an occurrence outside of the normal everyday activities within a community, events are likely to create some sort of inconvenience for members of the host population. Additionally, an event of any size is capable of generating behavioural consequences where participants engage in excessive or underage drinking, rowdy and delinquent behaviour, and vandalism.

Aside from the differences in the size of the events studied, one reason for the variation in the results of these three studies may be due to differences in the sets of items measured. That is, the factors can only be derived from, and be representative of the initial set of items from which they were extracted (Edwards, 2005). So where different studies use a different range of impact items, in different contextual settings, the resulting social impact dimensions are likely to differ for this reason.

5.2.1 Relationships between the Factors

In examining the correlations between each of the factors, a number of strong relationships were found. Relationships were found between inconvenience and behavioural consequences; inconvenience and personal frustration; community identity and cohesion and entertainment and socialisation opportunities; and between community identity and cohesion and community growth and development. These findings suggest that the six factors do not exist in isolation, but rather have connections and relationships with each other.

The largest correlation was found between inconvenience and behavioural consequences ($r = 0.699$, $p < 0.01$). This relationship can best be explained by viewing behavioural consequences as leading to inconvenience being felt on the part of local residents. Behavioural consequences that can result from a festival include vandalism, underage drinking and delinquent behaviour. The occurrence of these

impacts can potentially lead to a range of impacts including noise and litter, which are perceived as an inconvenience by local residents.

It was also found that inconvenience is related to personal frustration (r = 0.527, p <0.01). This relationship can be understood by examining the items which make up each factor. It is the presence of more visitors and the inconvenience impacts they cause, such as increased traffic, parking issues and crowding, which create the feelings of personal frustration experienced by residents. When residents cannot get to their normal shops because of road closures, cannot park easily and encounter crowds in the streets, they become inconvenienced. One Rockford respondent noted that *"as a person who shops on a Saturday it is most inconvenient to have the streets shut off and not be able to park near the shops, to then have to carry large loads of shopping"*. When this inconvenience disrupts the normal routines of residents, personal frustration results. Residents may not be able to get to their Saturday sport game easily, or hobby classes in the local hall have been cancelled as the hall is being used as a festival venue. For example, in Rockford, "*the senior citizens rooms had tent pegs up to the cement path at the entrance and we couldn't have our art class because of the festival activity and having no place to park"*. The frustration felt by local residents continues to rise as visitor numbers increase. It is often out of this frustration that residents decide not to attend the festival and avoid the attractions at the festival. As one Hadley respondent commented, "*the organisers need to look at improving roads closed to the festival and creating dedicated parking areas. This will reduce people's frustration"*.

A large correlation between community identity and cohesion and entertainment and socialisation opportunities (r = 0.649, p <0.01) suggests that when people are engaged in entertainment and socialising with others, increased feelings of community identity and cohesion can result. For example, by interacting with other members of the community, meeting new people at the festival or sharing family experiences, residents are able to experience the entertainment and socialisation opportunities provided by the festival. It is their involvement with others in the festival which helps develop a sense of community identity, as members of the community come together to share in the entertainment opportunities provided to them by the festival.

Community identity and cohesion exhibits a large correlation with community growth and development (0.633, $p < 0.01$). Community identity and the sense of ownership and pride that people feel about the festival can lead to community growth and development. Members of the community are able to develop new skills and community groups can take advantage of fundraising opportunities, which help further grow and develop the community as a whole. This relationship, however, can be viewed as a cycle. As one Hadley respondent commented, *"community cohesiveness and our sense of belonging are reinforced when working together to raise money for the primary school"*. That is, in the process of their involvement with the festival, developing new skills and helping the wider community, community members also achieve a heightened sense of identity and connectedness to others.

The identification of the six factors of inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences, provide the answer to the question, what are the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals?. These six dimensions serve to summarise the social impacts of community festivals, and do not exist in isolation but rather are interrelated with one another.

5.3 What are a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival?

5.3.1 Residents' Expectations of Social Impacts

Respondents in both Hadley and Rockford expected 30 positive social impacts to result from their festival. However, in relation to expected negative impacts, respondents in Rockford expected a much greater number of negatives than did respondents in Hadley. Hadley respondents expected only 33 negative impacts compared to the 41 negative impacts expected by respondents in Rockford.

Overall there was a greater number of negative impacts expected than positive impacts. One reason for this could be that negative impacts tend to be tangible, while many positive impacts are intangible. For example, negative social impacts such as noise, litter, delinquent behaviour and traffic represent visible impacts that are on display for residents to see and experience. In contrast, some of the positive social impacts are less visible, including community togetherness and an increased pride in the town. Another reason may be that residents can recall more easily the negative impacts of the festival, given their visible nature, whereas the less obvious positive social impacts don't come to mind as easily without prompting. However, this does not mean that overall the festivals were not successful, or that the positive impacts were outweighed by negative impacts. This is explained in later discussion of residents' perceptions of the social impacts.

Community-identified Impacts

The expectations data allowed an additional set of 'community-identified' impacts to be identified, which can be used to supplement those impacts already included in the SIP scale. Some of the positive community-identified impacts which residents anticipate and look forward to experiencing include:

- positive impacts on the youth in the area
- bringing a small town alive
- encouraging interest in music and the development of music skills, particularly related to the younger members of the community.

These are some of the important impacts that respondents in Hadley and Rockford want their festivals to achieve. For example, many respondents mentioned the importance of their festival in providing positive impacts for the town's youth related to providing "*something for our youth to get involved in!"*, giving youth *"an outlet for social interaction and enjoyment of the musical offerings"*. As Hadley and Rockford are both small communities, many respondents shared the view that *"a lot of our youth are reasonably sheltered from many things such as music, crowds, and diverse people. For a short time, the festival opens their eyes to the big wide world"*. Respondents in both Hadley and Rockford also mentioned the importance of a festival in providing *"stimulation for local children with musical ambitions"*, and

that it has *"greatly increased interest in music in the schools"*. One Hadley respondent commented that the festival *"provides our youth with music interests some exposure to what is happening 'out there'. This has impacted on the interest and musical talent of local school students"*. Respondents also value the way in which the festival *"brings a small town to life"*. As one respondent in Hadley commented, *"the town overall has a vibrancy to it, and people who take time to assess the town say they feel the place is alive"*. As an observer at the Hadley Music Festival, the researcher experienced this feeling for herself. Having been in Hadley prior to the festival, the change in atmosphere during the festival weekend was evident. The town felt more alive, it was buzzing with people and the atmosphere was one of fun and celebration.

Interestingly, several of these impacts identified by respondents are more about the community benefits than the potential tourism or economic benefits a festival can bring. This suggests that residents of small communities such as Hadley and Rockford are interested in the potential social benefits that a festival can create, such as the impacts they can have on the town's youth and their musical development, and how a festival can bring a small community alive.

Negative impacts identified by the community include:

- youth related impacts
- negative residents
- impacts on older residents of the community.

In both Hadley and Rockford, respondents were concerned about the negative impacts the festival had on local youth. Some respondents expressed concern at the *"number of young children being able to wander the streets late at night"*, and *"teenagers in mass who are out for a good time and are not under the control of elders"*. In Rockford, respondents commented on the *"crowds of young people hanging out in town, but seemingly not interested in music"*.

Respondents in both Hadley and Rockford perceived one of the negative impacts of the festival to be residents who voice their opinions against the festival. For example, respondents in both communities noted that *"there is always a group who*

don't want anything to change", and that there are *"residents who will find something to complain about in everything"*.

A negative impact that was specific to respondents in Rockford, related to the impacts of the festival on older residents within the community. Respondents expressed concern over the *"disturbances caused to all residents within the Rockford nursing home, which is very close to the music venues"*. Others recognised that the festival is *"a nuisance for the elderly"* and that *"for the elderly residents living near the venues, they find it a bit intimidating"*.

These negative impacts are issues that concern the communities of Hadley and Rockford. Interestingly, these negative community-identified impacts are also about the direct effects of a festival on the people living within the community. That is, residents recognise a number of impacts that negatively affect specific members of their community, such as youth and the elderly. This suggests that residents can reflect on the ways in which their community and its members are differentially affected by a festival.

Importantly, many of the above community-identified impacts are not identified in the literature on the social impacts of events. This is because these impacts are context-specific to the particular communities being studied. This highlights the need to always consider this aspect in future studies, by allowing the community its own voice in identifying the range of impacts they perceive a festival to have on them.

It is important to note that the 'community-identified' impacts were able to be organised under the six dimensions of social impacts. The qualitative data therefore supports the comprehensive nature of the six dimensions of social impacts identified through the factor analysis, given that the expected impacts that respondents listed without prompting, fit into the previously defined dimensions.

5.3.2 Residents' Perceptions of Social Impacts

In answering the question, 'what are the host community's perceptions of the social impacts of their festival?', section 5.3.2 will provide discussion under seven main

areas. First, the perceptions of impact occurrence in both Hadley and Rockford are discussed, outlining which social impact dimensions were perceived to have occurred or not. Second, the impacts perceived as having positive effects on the host communities are discussed, and third, the impacts perceived as having negative effects on the host communities are discussed. Fourth is a discussion of the variations in these perceptions, explaining how an impact perceived as negative by one person may be perceived positively by another. Fifth, respondents rating of the non-occurrence of certain impacts is examined. Sixth is the presentation of a number of qualifications used by residents to justify their perceptions of the impacts. Finally, the extrinsic event factors introduced in section 2.4.1 are used to explain why the perceptions of impacts differed between respondents in Hadley and Rockford.

Perceptions of Impact Occurrence

In Hadley, a large majority of respondents perceived impacts in the inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community growth and development dimensions to have occurred. That is, respondents shared similar perceptions of the occurrence of these impacts as a result of their festival.

Conversely respondents in Hadley disagreed on the occurrence of impacts in the personal frustration and behavioural consequences dimensions, which implies that these impacts were perceived differently by different members of the community. For example, respondents disagreed on whether or not the festival led to a disruption in the normal routines of local residents. They also disagreed on whether underage drinking, delinquent behaviour and vandalism occurred. It seems that what represents a disruption to one person may not be considered a disruption by another and, moreover, that there are some types of impacts from which local residents are sheltered. As an observer at the festival, the researcher saw underage drinking and rowdy behaviour occurring. However this was later in the evening, and anyone who attended the festival only during the day may have been unaware that these impacts were in fact taking place. Respondents may therefore have felt that they lacked the necessary knowledge or understanding required to judge the occurrence of these impacts.

In Rockford, a large majority of respondents perceived impacts in the inconvenience, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and behavioural consequences dimensions to have occurred. However, respondents in Rockford expressed disagreement on impact occurrence in the community identity and cohesion, and community growth and development dimensions, suggesting that different members of the community perceive these types of impacts differently. Community identity and cohesion impacts were perceived differently by respondents based on how involved they were with the festival. For example, someone involved in the organisation and running of the festival was more likely to perceive these impacts to have occurred, whereas someone who was not involved with the festival was less likely to perceive that the impacts occurred. Similarly with the community growth and development impacts, those residents who were more closely involved with the festival perceived the impacts of increased job opportunities, development of new skills and fundraising opportunities to have occurred.

The following two sections will discuss which impact dimensions are perceived positively, and which are perceived negatively by residents in both Hadley and Rockford.

Perceived Positive Impacts

In both Hadley and Rockford, the greatest positive impacts occurred in the community identity and cohesion, community growth and development, and entertainment and socialisation opportunities dimensions. For each of these dimensions, the results show that Hadley respondents perceived higher levels of positive impacts and Rockford respondents perceived lower levels of positive impacts.

Respondents in both Hadley and Rockford rated impacts in the community identity and cohesion dimension as the most positive impacts resulting from their festival. In particular, the impacts related to an enhanced community identity; creation of an image which encourages tourism to the region; a sense of community ownership of the festival; and the increased pride felt by local residents in the town were assigned the highest positive ratings. The highest ratings given to community identity and cohesion impacts can be attributed to two reasons. First, the festivals are organised

and run by the host community using local volunteers and organising committees, and second, both festivals originated out of the community to reflect and celebrate valued aspects of their way of life. For these reasons, the festivals provide opportunities for bringing together members of the community to work towards a common goal. In achieving this goal, and staging a successful community festival, individual members of the community are able to feel proud of their efforts, and may benefit from an increased sense of identity.

In both Hadley and Rockford the local communities perceived the entertainment and socialisation opportunities to be a positive outcome of hosting a festival. The impacts in the entertainment and socialisation opportunities dimension assigned the highest positive ratings include having more visitors in the community; the opportunity to host family and friends from out of town; and opportunities for social interaction with other members of the community. This is an indication that members of the local community value the increased entertainment opportunities offered to them as a result of the festival taking place in their community. As one Hadley respondent noted, *"the festival is a social event that brings some much-needed activity and entertainment to what is mostly a very boring place!"*. The festival not only brings more visitors to town, allowing them opportunities to meet new people and partake in social interactions, but the festival provides a reason for family and friends from out of town to come and stay with them. In Rockford, one respondent commented that *"ever since the music festival started we have had friends from Melbourne and as far as Sydney come and stay with us for the weekend. It's been a good opportunity for a regular annual catch-up with friends"*.

In the community growth and development dimension, Hadley and Rockford respondents assigned the highest positive ratings to the fundraising opportunities provided to local community groups and that community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival. Respondents in both communities perceived that fundraising opportunities were an important outcome of the festival. For example Rockford respondents perceived the festival as providing opportunities for *"service clubs to participate and raise funds for good causes"* and specifically for *"organisations and clubs to raise money from people outside the immediate community"*. In Hadley, one resident commented that *"money raised by selling hot*

dogs at the Hadley Music Festival has allowed us to put a new roof on our Masonic Lodge". Respondents believed it was a positive outcome that the festivals bring together diverse groups of the community. In Hadley, *"people are brought together to work towards a common goal, all on behalf of their respective clubs"*. Similarly, in Rockford, *"collaboration between the various community volunteer groups helps deliver a great musical and social event"*.

Perceived Negative Impacts

It was found that respondents in both Hadley and Rockford rated impacts in the behavioural consequences, personal frustration and inconvenience dimensions as the most negative. For each of these three dimensions, the results show that Hadley respondents perceived lower levels of negative impacts resulting from their festival while Rockford respondents perceived higher levels of negative impacts.

Within the behavioural consequences dimension, the impacts related to underage drinking and vandalism were assigned the highest negative ratings, particularly by respondents in Rockford. These ratings are confirmed by the open-ended comments provided by respondents in the residents' perceptions questionnaire, as well as the researcher's own observations at each of the festivals. A Rockford respondent commented that *"there was a very ugly side to this festival in 2004. Several people (visitors) asked if it was always this bad*". As an observer at the festival, the researcher viewed this 'ugly side' firsthand. Underage drinking was a visible problem on the streets, with many youths who were clearly underage openly consuming alcohol. Other groups of youths were hanging around in the main street, their presence creating a threatening atmosphere for others. One reason given by respondents for this increased incidence of underage drinking and delinquent behaviour was the timing of the festival to coincide with Schoolies Week, the end of year celebration for school-leavers. *"The 2004 Schoolies Week coincided with the festival. These two events at the same time are not helpful."* Another respondent commented that many of these youths did not even attend the festival: *"To hold a festival like this which coincides with Schoolies Week is absurd. Of course there will be trouble with drunken youths using the festival as a binge party, whilst not actually paying for a ticket or attending any of the music tents"*. Therefore many of these youths were not actually within the festival precinct, but rather were out having their

own parties in the main street and throughout the town. This is where the behavioural consequences including underage drinking, and rowdy and delinquent behaviour were observed by the researcher, not within the festival precinct itself. However, these impacts can be seen as being induced by the festival.

Of particular concern to respondents in the personal frustration dimension was the frustration caused by the increased number of visitors in town, and that the festival served to disrupt their everyday routines. For example, in Rockford, where access to the public boat ramp is cut off for almost the entire weekend, several respondents commented that this interferes with their normal weekend activities. One respondent explained how the closing of the boat ramp *"interferes with both of my main recreational pursuits - fishing and diving"*. Having their normal routines disrupted appears to be an issue of concern to the community, and as such, the organisers should try to minimise such negative impacts, where possible. For example, efforts towards minimising unwanted restrictions to the daily activities of residents should be undertaken, to ensure that locals, within reason, can continue to access local facilities which they use as part of their everyday life.

The inconvenience impacts related to road closures and redirections, increased litter, and difficulty finding car parking were assigned the highest negative ratings by respondents in both Hadley and Rockford. These types of inconvenience impacts are referred to in the literature as those commonly resulting from the hosting of a festival (Dwyer et al., 2000; Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001; Allen et al., 2005; Kim & Petrick, 2005). Having road closures and redirections in place serves to cause physical inconvenience to locals who cannot drive into town as usual. These were in place in both festivals, to allow for the main street to be closed off, acting as the venue for the street parties. Related to these road closures, locals then faced greater difficulty in gaining car parking, given that some of the parking spaces within the main street were blocked off. This sentiment was expressed by many respondents in both Hadley and Rockford, who commented that *"Hadley was too congested to drive, park or shop on festival weekend"*, and that *"it was necessary to avoid going into Rockford to do any shopping because there was no parking available close to the shops"*. Even many of those people not participating in the festival, and trying to avoid it, were still faced with certain inconveniences. For example, one respondent

in Rockford commented that *"although I did not attend, I had to drive my daughter to work and had to detour. There was traffic and the trip was much slower"*.

The inconvenience caused by road closures and difficulties finding car parking are issues that concern a certain proportion of the host community. For some respondents, such as the elderly or people with limited mobility, these impacts would have been more than an inconvenience. Festival organisers could consider developing strategies to minimise the inconvenience to these groups. For example, volunteers could be recruited to assist elderly members of the community to do their shopping. Such action on the part of the organisers would serve to alleviate some of the inconvenience to particularly affected groups of the community, and would demonstrate the organisers' concern for the impacts a festival has on its host community.

Variations in Perceptions and Dual Dimensions

This research has found that not all impacts are perceived in the same way by all residents within a community. This idea aligns with a social-constructionist framework, which acknowledges that perceptions of reality are constructed by individuals, and thus there may be multiple realities within any one social setting (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Jennings, 2001; Neuman, 2006; Walliman, 2006). In this research, it was found that an impact perceived as negative by one person may be perceived positively by another. This is evidenced by the item 'more visitors to the community', which was perceived by different respondents as both a positive and a negative impact. Some residents perceived positive outcomes from having more visitors to the community related to the opportunity for entertainment and socialisation, while others perceived negative outcomes, related to the disruption to their everyday lives. Another item that was perceived as having both a positive and negative impact was 'impacts on local trade'. Those who saw this as a positive social impact made reference to the "*increased business for local shops*" and how the festival "*promotes higher trading levels for the various businesses in the town to help them remain viable"*. Other respondents saw this as a negative impact, referring to "*outside food vans which take business away from the local shops"* and recognising that "*some businesses actually lose trade due to the road closure"*. This supports the findings of Small and Edwards (2003) who argue that agreement is not

always reached with respect to the nature of impacts on residents. This lack of agreement suggests that it is important to take care when making statements about the social impacts arising from festivals, as people's perceptions of those impacts can differ (Small et al., 2005). That is, care should be taken to not label certain impacts as positive and others as negative, as this could differ for different people.

As an extension of this, if different members of a community can perceive the same impact as both a positive and a negative, then we have to allow for the existence of 'dual dimensions'. That is, within any of the six social impact dimensions, there may be certain impacts which contribute positively to that dimension, but also other impacts which contribute negatively. The existence of dual dimensions was found in the community identity and cohesion, community growth and development and entertainment and socialisation opportunities dimensions. For example, within the community identity and cohesion dimension, impacts that contribute positively include a sense of community ownership and the pride that residents take in their festival. However, impacts that negatively affect community identity and cohesion include having residents who are negative about the festival, the perception of inappropriate festival sponsors, and a general dissatisfaction with the organisation of the festival. These are impacts which detract from the feelings of identity and connectedness that a community can experience as a result of hosting a festival. This finding reinforces the appropriateness of not labelling the six dimensions as either positive or negative in nature.

Non-occurrence Impact Ratings

A number of impacts within the inconvenience, personal frustration and behavioural consequences dimensions that were perceived not to have occurred, such as difficulty finding car parking, disruption to the normal routines of locals, underage drinking and vandalism, were assigned either a very small positive impact or neutral/no impact rating. Hence, respondents felt that their not occurring was a positive impact.

However, other impacts perceived not to have occurred, particularly in the community identity and cohesion, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community growth and development dimensions, were rated as negative impacts, illustrating that these are impacts that respondents would like to see occur.

Respondents in both Hadley and Rockford rated non-occurrence of these impacts as negative, with ratings ranging from very small to moderate negative impacts throughout all categories. Such impacts that respondents feel are important, and which they value and look forward to, include:

- increased entertainment opportunities for the local community
- opportunities for social interaction with other members of the community
- the festival providing opportunities for shared family experiences
- enhanced community identity
- creating an image which encourages tourism to the region
- community groups working together to achieve the goals of the festival.

Also of interest is that some respondents rated the non-occurrence of certain inconvenience impacts as a negative impact. In Hadley, respondents who disagreed that there was increased traffic saw this as having a *very small negative impact*. In Rockford, respondents who disagreed that local shops and facilities were crowded rated this as a *small negative impact*, and those who didn't think the footpaths and streets were crowded rated this a *very small negative impact*. Therefore, in contrast to what is argued in the literature, impacts such as crowding and traffic congestion are not always perceived to be negative impacts by a host community. In this study, residents were unhappy to see a lack of crowding and congestion, since it represented a lack of 'busy-ness' in their community, possibly signifying a lack of success of their festival. Wanting their streets to be more crowded illustrates residents' support for the festival and the perceived benefits it can provide to their community. This finding is also supported by the idea of there being multiple constructed realities, as suggested by a social-constructionist framework (Jennings, 2001; Neuman, 2006; Walliman, 2006). That is, there are multiple interpretations of the social impacts arising from a festival, as different people interpret impacts in different ways.

The findings of this research regarding non-occurrence impact ratings suggest that it is just as important to understand the perceptions of impacts that have occurred as those that haven't occurred. By allowing respondents to rate both impact occurrence and non-occurrence, the SIP scale serves to deliver more detailed information regarding residents' perceptions of social impacts. Valuable information such as the

types of impacts that respondents feel are important, and that they want to occur as a result of their festival, can be gained through the analysis of non-impact occurrence ratings. For example, it is important for event organisers to know that local residents want a festival to provide opportunities for shared family experiences, and that they see this not occurring as a negative aspect of the festival. Thus these non-occurrence ratings can provide additional insights into the impacts that resident's value as a result of a festival, and which can thus be targeted by event organisers in the future delivery of the festival.

Qualified Responses

Through the open-ended questions, it was found that many respondents chose to qualify or justify their response in some way. Respondents used these qualifications to help further explain their perceptions of the positive and negative social impacts of community festivals. For several of the positive impacts, respondents not only stated that they perceived the impact to have occurred, but also that it had occurred at such a level which *"exceeded their expectations"*. Other respondents stated that whilst some positive impacts were perceived to have occurred, they occurred at levels that were *"not as high as the town hoped"*. These qualifications are useful in reinforcing issues of concern to the host community and, in particular, the impacts they hope will result from their festival.

In response to a number of perceived inconvenience impacts including increased noise levels, increased traffic, difficulty finding car parking and road closures, many respondents stated that the impacts *"were minimal"*, *"were under control"* or *"can be tolerated"*. Again, the findings support the idea that local communities are often prepared to put up with temporary inconvenience and disruption given the other positive benefits that they are likely to receive (Small & Edwards, 2003). Therefore it may be that whilst residents recognise that these negative social impacts occur, some residents are willing to tolerate negative impacts where they see them as being necessary to realise positive outcomes for the community as a whole, or where they perceive there to be strategies in place to deal with those negative impacts.

Where impacts such as underage drinking and delinquent behaviour were perceived to have occurred, respondents felt they were *"worse than expected"* and that they

had a *"significant effect on them"*. These qualifications stand in contrast to those given above in relation to a number of inconvenience impacts. This suggests that residents' willingness to tolerate negative impacts will depend on the type of impact that is occurring. That is, whilst residents may be prepared to tolerate inconvenience impacts such as traffic and parking difficulties, they are less willing to tolerate behavioural consequences such as underage drinking and delinquent behaviour because these impacts diminish positive transactions in the community.

Extrinsic Factors Affecting Residents' Perceptions of Impacts

The previous discussion examined residents' perceptions of impacts, identifying which dimensions were perceived to create the greatest positive impacts and which resulted in negative impacts. The following discussion uses the extrinsic event variables outlined in section 2.4.1 to explain the differences in the perceptions of impacts between the Hadley and Rockford respondents. The extrinsic variables including the age of an event, its theme and spatial concentration are used to help explain why Hadley respondents consistently perceived higher levels of positive impacts and Rockford respondents consistently perceived higher levels of negative impacts.

Age of Event

It has been suggested that over time, where an event has been held for a number of years, residents' perceptions of impacts often become less negative (Fredline, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). Often this can be attributed to the ability of local residents to adapt to an event or to simply accept a certain level of negative impacts which they can tolerate for the period of the festival. In the case of the Hadley Music Festival, after 14 years, the festival is well established in the community. Due to past experiences, many residents have adopted an attitude which acknowledges that although negative social impacts do occur, *"the benefits far outweigh the negatives"*. Others recognised that it is only for *"one weekend in the year"*. Hadley residents can also be seen to have adopted certain coping mechanisms such as *"shopping earlier in the week"* to avoid needing to go into town during the festival weekend or *"leaving town for the weekend"*.

Residents' perceptions of impacts may also become less negative over time because of the increasing skills of festival organisers in minimising a festival's negative impacts. A number of Hadley respondents specifically commented on how the organising committee has improved over the years in trying to address community concerns. One respondent commented that *"concerns about street drinking being addressed proved to me that the organising committee realise the value and importance of maintaining community support for the success of the festival"*. Another felt that *"the organising committee seems to have learnt from the previous years those areas that were negative. They always try to improve and seem to have become quite professional"*. Thus over time festival management in Hadley has improved and more importantly festival organisers have demonstrated that they are sensitive to community concerns and take steps to develop strategies to address them. This emphasises the positive outcomes that occur when an organising committee learns from each successive festival and takes genuine action to improve positive outcomes for the community.

Event Theme

It has been suggested that where the theme for an event comes from within the community, the community is more likely to embrace the event (Hall, 1989; Getz, 1991; Derrett, 2004). The themes for both the Hadley Music Festival and Rockford Music Festival were developed in this way, with the idea for each festival stemming from grassroots community interest, progressed by a strong community base which formed the organising committees and large volunteer contingent.

However a number of respondents in Rockford expressed concern over the gradual loss of community ownership of the festival. One respondent commented that *"in the early years of the festival, it was much smaller and I believe a far more community-orientated event"*. Another observed that *"there are a lot of unhappy locals who are very disappointed in the way the festival has gone over the past 8 years"*. A number of respondents made similar comments which express concern that *"the music festival has lost its way. It is no longer a community event"*. This loss of community orientation is perceived to be related to the changing organisation and management structure of the festival, which is now at its greatest level of professionalism. A number of residents have expressed concerns that the increasing

professionalism and *"business-like operation"* of the festival is taking away from the community nature of the festival.

This supports the suggestion made by Gursoy et al. (2004) that there needs to be agreement between the organisers and the wider community as to the goals and purpose of a festival. Without this, issues arise relating to the continuing level of community support for the festival. In Rockford, the festival is developing in a way that is in disharmony with certain sections of the community. Questions are now being asked as to whether the festival remains a 'community festival', or whether it is in fact a business. This perceived loss of community orientation is one factor which may help to explain why residents are becoming more critical of the festival and the negative impacts that it continues to have on the host community.

One respondent commented that while "*it remains a good idea to have a festival, it needs to reassess its goals to come more into line with the resident community's values and aspirations*". This issue needs to be addressed in order to ensure continued support from the host community. However, should community support continue to decline, then fewer people will become involved in the festival, and the opportunities for social interaction and the building of relationships will also decline. This would likely have negative implications for community wellbeing and the level of social capital within the community.

Spatial Concentration of the Event

Findings from this research partially support the argument that where event activities are spread throughout a community, the social impacts are also spread over a wider area (Fredline, 2000). In Hadley where the venues were spread throughout the main street, both positive and negative impacts were spread throughout the area. For example, groups of people moving through the main street from one venue to another created increased business for local traders located in the main street; however the movement of people also created problems with noise, litter, rowdiness and delinquent behaviour.

In contrast, the findings do not fully support the argument that where an event is held in one confined area of the community, the impacts are also confined (Murphy,

1985). In Rockford where the festival was primarily staged within a separate precinct, the crowds, noise and litter were contained, to a certain extent, during the time of the festival. However, when people left the precinct at the conclusion of the festival, their noise and litter were spread throughout the town as they made their way home or back to their accommodation. Conversely, opportunities for local businesses to benefit from the increased trade were limited, as people didn't need to leave the festival compound to purchase food and drink.

It is the way in which impacts such as crowds, noise and litter are managed that determines the amount of impact they have on the host community. In Hadley, because the venues were spread throughout the main street, the security, police presence and litter clean-up had to cover this wider area also. This resulted in residents being much less negative about these types of impacts, as they saw a strong police presence and litter clean-up crew in the venues and the main street. In Rockford, whilst impacts such as underage drinking, litter and delinquent behaviour were well controlled in the festival precinct, this did not seem to extend into the remainder of the town. Many respondents expressed a similar concern that "*while rubbish was attended to within the confines of the event, the rest of the town and parks were dreadful*". From the researcher's own observations, within the festival precinct there were visible clean-up crews, security and police presence. However, outside of the precinct, where there were noticeable occurrences of youth drinking and other bad behaviour, there was no visible police presence. The management of impacts outside the festival precinct was lacking in Rockford, which resulted in more negative community perceptions. Residents don't see boundaries and distinctions, but rather for them, the festival is in 'the community' regardless of where it may be physically located. Managing the impacts outside the festival precinct then becomes just as important as managing the impacts within the precinct. Therefore, managed poorly, confining a festival has the potential for more negative impacts than spreading the festival throughout a community.

5.4 Are there distinct subgroups within a community who differ in their feelings towards a festival?

Cluster analysis identified five community subgroups who differ in their feelings towards their festival. The clusters, named the tolerators, economically connected, attendees, avoiders and volunteers, as presented in section 4.7.2, were identified on the basis of respondent demographics, interest and involvement with the festival.

Cluster 1, the 'tolerators', are those members of a community who adopt an attitude of tolerance to a festival taking place in their community. The tolerators have a relatively low connection with the festival. Only a very small proportion of tolerators volunteered for the festival, only a small number worked in tourism, and no-one in this cluster undertook any paid work on the weekend of the festival. In fact, the majority of this cluster didn't even attend the festival. Regardless of this low connection with the festival, the tolerators are happy for it to take place in their community. This attitude can be explained by examining the key demographic characteristics of the tolerators. They are the oldest cluster with 99.1% of its members aged over 55 years, and 83.5% of tolerators are retired. The tolerators represent the older members of a community, who although themselves are not necessarily interested in attending the festival, nor do they benefit economically from it, they do recognise that there are others in the community who enjoy and benefit from the festival, and are therefore willing to tolerate it taking place in their community. As one respondent commented, *"the music is not for my taste, but I appreciate that the festival provides a great deal of pleasure for the younger generations"*.

Cluster 2, the 'economically connected', consists of those members of a community who work in tourism, and who undertook paid work on the weekend of the festival. Almost half of this cluster are self-employed, and a sizeable proportion are employed in service industry occupations. They can be seen as those members of a community who are more likely to gain economic benefits from the hosting of a festival. What is interesting, however, is the range of attitudes this group holds towards the festival. There is a large percentage who claim to love the festival and want it to continue, a similar percentage who only tolerate the festival because of the benefits it brings to

the wider community, and a small percentage who dislike the festival and would be happier if it didn't continue. Those who love the festival may be those businesses which benefit from the increased number of visitors in town. A number of respondents identified that the businesses benefiting most included *"accommodation providers, B&B's, and hotels"*, and *"retail, coffee shops, and restaurants"*. Those who dislike the festival may own businesses that close down for the festival weekend knowing that trade will be minimal, or own a business which "*actually loses trade due to the road closures"*. This was the case in Rockford, where some businesses located in the main street outside of the festival precinct had low levels of business.

Cluster 3, the 'attendees', are those members of the community who attend the festival. Ninety-three percent of attendees show an interest in the theme and are happy that the festival takes place. The large majority of attendees love the festival and hope that it continues. However, outside of their attendance, this cluster has the lowest connection to tourism and the festival. The attendees consist of the smallest percentage of people who volunteer for the festival and the smallest percentage of people working in tourism. A small proportion of this cluster did undertake some form of paid work during the weekend of the festival, and therefore they have a small economic connection. Regardless of low tourism and volunteer connections, the attendees have a strong link with the festival through their participation. This high level of participation can be explained by examining their key demographic characteristics. This cluster represents the youngest cluster, who are employed full time and who earn the highest incomes. This combination of variables explains both their low volunteer connection and high attendance or participation connection. Given that the attendees are predominantly employed in full-time positions, they have little time to volunteer for the festival. While many people's primary motivation for volunteering is to receive a free ticket to the festival, this is not the case for the attendees who are easily able to afford festival tickets.

Cluster 4, the 'avoiders', are members of the community who adopt an attitude of avoidance towards the festival. They do this by not attending the festival, staying away from town during the festival or leaving town for the weekend. The avoiders have a low volunteer and tourism employment connection to the festival. Also, none of the avoiders undertook any paid work on the weekend of the festival, and

therefore have no direct economic benefits to be gained. Of all the clusters, the avoiders consist of the largest percentage of people who dislike the festival and would be happier if it didn't continue, even though the majority of avoiders are interested in the theme. It is therefore the festival as a whole, rather than the theme itself, with which they are unhappy. The avoiders are made up of older residents of a community, the majority aged between 55-64 and 65-74. They are also, in large part, the long-term residents who have lived in their community for over 41 years.

Cluster 5, the 'volunteers', are the community members who volunteer for the festival, which may include its organisation, set-up, running and shut-down. Everyone in this cluster volunteered for the festival at some point either before, during or after the festival, with 91.6% having volunteer involvement during the festival weekend. The remainder of volunteers either attended the festival or were working. The majority of volunteers love the festival and hope that it continues, while a smaller proportion tolerate the festival because of the wider benefits it brings to the community. Therefore for some volunteers, it may be their interest in the theme which leads them to become involved with the festival. However, for other volunteers who show no interest in music, the festival itself may be secondary to other motivations. Getz (1995) suggests that motivations related to involvement in the community, socialising and prestige, are often of higher priority than involvement in the event itself. Respondents provided some insight into these varied motivations explaining that they volunteer *"to help out in some small way"*, because they *"really enjoy the community work and get to meet many interesting people"*, and because they *"enjoy the personal challenge to do better than last year"*. This cluster is demographically distinct from the others in that its members range from 35-64 years. Therefore one benefit gained by volunteers may be the opportunity to mix with various other members of their community. One respondent commented that the festival is *"a great age barrier breaker as volunteers are from all age groups who get a chance to work together"*. By bringing together people from diverse age groups within the community, one outcome can be the development of bridging social capital.

Similarities can be drawn between the five clusters identified in this study and those proposed by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005a) in their study of residents' perceptions of

the impacts of tourism in five tourist regions in Victoria, Australia. The economically connected cluster has similarities with Inbakaran and Jackson's (2005a) 'tourism industry connection' cluster, which consists of those residents with the highest occupational connection to the tourism industry. The volunteers cluster is similar to the 'high tourism connection' cluster identified by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005a), which is made up of residents who exhibit the highest volunteer connection with the tourism industry. Similar to the tolerators cluster that has a relatively low connection with the festival is Inbakaran and Jackson's (2005a) 'neutral tourism development' cluster. This cluster has the lowest overall connection to tourism in either volunteer or occupational terms. Finally, the avoiders cluster is similar to Inbakaran and Jackson's (2005a) 'low tourism connection' cluster. In the same way in which the avoiders have a relatively low connection with the festival and are quite negative towards it, the 'low tourism connection' cluster also exhibits low volunteer and occupational connections to the tourism industry, in conjunction with negative attitudes. There exists no match between the attendees cluster identified in this research and any of Inbakaran and Jackson's (2005a) four clusters. The attendees cluster is specifically related to people's participation in a community festival, and therefore has no direct parallel in a study of residents' perceptions of tourism more generally.

5.5 Do these subgroups hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals?

This research found that the tolerators, economically connected, attendees, avoiders and volunteers do hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. These patterns were not only evident on individual impact items, but across the six impact dimensions of inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences. The following discussion presents the differences and similarities in the perceptions of impacts held by the five clusters on the six social impact dimensions. Where the pattern of responses between the clusters is similar for more than one impact dimension, this discussion has been grouped.

Social exchange theory is used to understand the different views held by each of these five community subgroups. Social exchange theory suggests that residents will evaluate a festival as either positive or negative in terms of the expected benefits and costs they will incur (Ap, 1992). If residents perceive themselves to have benefited from the exchange then they will likely have positive perceptions; however if negative impacts are perceived to outweigh the benefits, they will likely have negative perceptions.

5.5.1 Inconvenience and Personal Frustration

Regarding inconvenience and personal frustration impacts, it was found that the avoiders are clearly differentiated from the tolerators, attendees and volunteers on their perceptions of impacts. The tolerators, attendees and volunteers shared the perception of several of these impacts as positive in nature, or as only neutral or very small negative impacts, while in contrast, the avoiders hold strongly negative perceptions of impacts in these dimensions. Therefore, in relation to inconvenience and personal frustration impacts caused by the festival, the avoiders feel most negatively affected. This represents an example of social exchange theory as residents determine the balance of positive and negative impacts affecting them. The tolerators, attendees and volunteers perceive the negative impacts to be minimal, and are willing to put up with them given other positive impacts they gain from the festival. For example, the attendees receive entertainment benefits, the volunteers gain positive outcomes from their involvement in the festival, and the tolerators are happy to see the wider benefits accruing to the community as a whole. In contrast, the majority of avoiders who don't attend the festival perceive these inconvenience and personal frustration impacts as outweighing any other positive impacts.

The economically connected cluster share similar negative perceptions as the avoiders on both the inconvenience and personal frustration impacts, but they did not rate the impacts as strongly. Although they have economic benefits to be gained from the festival, the economically connected cluster still recognise the negative impacts of the festival which serve to inconvenience them for the duration of the festival weekend. Also, as they are working during the festival, the economically

connected do not have the same opportunities to enjoy the festival, and therefore do not experience many of the positive aspects of the festival.

5.5.2 Behavioural Consequences

It was found that the avoiders hold different perceptions to the tolerators and volunteers in relation to the behavioural consequences of a festival. The avoiders perceive much higher levels of negative impact from the behavioural consequences such as vandalism and delinquent behaviour than do either the tolerators or volunteers. The lower levels of impact assigned to behavioural consequences by the tolerators and volunteers can be explained using social exchange theory, which suggests that the tolerators and volunteers will tolerate a certain level of negative impacts because of the other positive benefits they experience. However the avoiders who do not perceive themselves to benefit from any positive impacts of the festival tend to perceive the negatives related to behavioural consequences as outweighing any benefits, creating an overall negative perception.

The avoiders hold similar perceptions to the economically connected and attendees clusters in relation to behavioural consequences, to which large negative impact ratings were assigned. These high levels of negatives assigned by the economically connected and attendees clusters can be explained by their greater involvement in the festival, meaning that they are more likely to have firsthand experience with the behavioural consequences of a festival. Working or participating in a festival would bring people into more direct contact with underage drinkers and rowdy and delinquent behaviour. This would explain their more negative perceptions of the behavioural consequences of a festival.

5.5.3 Community Identity and Cohesion, Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities, and Community Growth and Development

The results suggest that for community identity and cohesion, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community growth and development impacts, the avoiders hold significantly different perceptions of impacts than every other cluster. While the tolerators, economically connected, attendees and volunteers perceive the impacts on community identity and cohesion as positive, the avoiders have assigned

negative ratings. As the cluster with the greatest proportion of people who don't attend the festival, and who leave town for the weekend, the avoiders would not feel the increased sense of community identity and cohesion that other clusters gain as a result of their involvement with the festival. Even more than not feeling this increased sense of community identity, the avoiders may actually feel excluded from their community. This would help to explain their negative impact ratings for items such as a sense of community togetherness, community ownership of the festival and increased pride in the town.

Regarding the entertainment and socialisation opportunities and community growth and development dimensions, where the tolerators, economically connected, attendees and volunteers have assigned strong positive impact ratings, the avoiders, on average, assigned a neutral/no impact rating. Again, by not attending the festival or leaving town for the weekend, the avoiders are not able to take advantage of the entertainment and socialisation opportunities provided by the festival. Also, with only very small proportions of avoiders volunteering for the festival, and none undertaking any paid work, this cluster is less able to benefit from the community growth and development impacts such as gaining new skills or increased job opportunities. The avoiders can also be seen as self-excluding themselves from many opportunities, choosing to leave town or not participate in the festival.

Although the economically connected cluster perceives community identity and cohesion, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, and community growth and development impacts as positive in nature, they are much less positive than the other clusters, assigning the lowest positive ratings. It seems that members of the economically connected cluster, who spend most of the festival weekend working, do not have the same opportunities to experience these types of impacts as do other clusters, particularly the attendees and volunteers. Through their participation in the festival, the attendees and volunteers are able to enjoy the entertainment and socialisation benefits, and in different ways can gain an increased sense of identity and connectedness with the community due to their participation. This helps explain the higher positive ratings by the attendees and volunteers and the lower positive ratings given by the economically connected cluster.

This discussion has demonstrated that the five community subgroups hold different perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. Table 45 below represents these perceptions, positioning the five clusters along a scale from the most negative to the most positive perceptions on each impact dimension. The avoiders are the most negative cluster across the six dimensions. The economically connected cluster is the second most negative, as they tend to recognise some of the positive impacts of a festival. The volunteers tend to hold the most positive perceptions, except for the behavioural consequences dimension, for which the tolerators are the most positive. The tolerators and attendees also hold strongly positive perceptions of the festival, with only slightly lower ratings than the volunteers.

Table 45: Perceptions of Social Impacts by Cluster

	CLUSTERS				
DIMENSION	**Most Negative**		**Impact Rating**		**Most Positive**
	←				→
Inconvenience	Avoiders	Economically Connected	Attendees	Tolerators	Volunteers
Community Identity and Cohesion	Avoiders	Economically Connected	Tolerators	Attendees	Volunteers
Personal Frustration	Avoiders	Economically Connected	Tolerators	Attendees	Volunteers
Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities	Avoiders	Economically Connected	Tolerators	Attendees	Volunteers
Community Growth and Development	Avoiders	Economically Connected	Tolerators	Attendees	Volunteers
Behavioural Consequences	Avoiders	Economically Connected	Attendees	Volunteers	Tolerators

By examining each cluster on the basis of its perceptions of impacts, some comparisons can be drawn between the five clusters identified in this research and the clusters identified in previous research (Davis et al., 1988; Schroeder, 1992; Ryan & Montgomery, 1994; Madrigal, 1995; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Williams & Lawson, 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a; Ryan & Cooper, 2004). The most significant parallel is that this study, like other

segmentation studies, has identified two extreme clusters – one most negative cluster and one most positive cluster, here represented as the avoiders and volunteers respectively. The avoiders have similarities with the most negative clusters identified in previous research, variously labelled the 'haters' (Davis et al., 1988; Schroeder, 1992; Madrigal, 1995; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000), 'somewhat irritated' (Ryan & Montgomery, 1994), 'cynics' (Williams & Lawson, 2001), 'opponents' (Weaver & Lawton, 2001), 'against tourism' (Ryan & Cooper, 2004) or 'most negative' (Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a) clusters. Whilst these clusters are named to reflect their negative perceptions, the avoiders cluster is named based on the feelings its members have towards the festival. This is as a result of the difference in clustering bases, as discussed in section 2.4.2. At the other extreme, this research identified the volunteers as the cluster that holds the most positive perceptions of the festival. This has parallels with the most positive cluster identified in previous studies, referred to as the 'lovers' (Davis et al., 1988; Schroeder, 1992; Madrigal, 1995; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Williams & Lawson, 2001), 'enthusiasts' (Ryan & Montgomery, 1994), 'supporters' (Weaver & Lawton, 2001), 'protourism' (Ryan & Cooper, 2004) or 'most positive' (Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a) clusters. However, the volunteers cluster is named based on the relationship its members have with the festival.

Whilst a number of previous studies identified a neutral cluster which lies in between the positive and negative extremes (Davis et al., 1988; Ryan & Montgomery, 1994; Williams & Lawson, 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a), such a parallel has not been identified in this research. Instead, the three clusters which lie in between the avoiders at the negative extreme and the volunteers at the positive extreme represent varying levels of positive and negative perceptions. The attendees and tolerators represent 'more positive' clusters, which hold mostly positive perceptions of the festival. The economically connected cluster represents a mixed positive and negative cluster. This cluster recognises both the positive and negative impacts of the festival, but rates the negatives lower than the avoiders, and the positives lower than the volunteers, attendees and tolerators. This cluster has some similarities with the 'realists' cluster identified by Schroeder (1992), Madrigal (1995) and Fredline and Faulkner (2000). The realists clusters identified in these studies hold both strong positive and strong negative perceptions of impacts. The realists and the

economically connected cluster are similar in that they have an economic connection, and are employed in either the tourism industry or undertaking work over the festival weekend.

5.5.4 Intrinsic Factors Affecting Residents' Perceptions of Impacts

The previous discussion examined the differing perceptions of social impacts held by the five community subgroups: tolerators, economically connected, attendees, avoiders and volunteers. The following discussion will examine the five clusters on a range of intrinsic variables including demographic characteristics, identification with the theme, level of participation, and economic dependence or involvement in tourism. These intrinsic variables were introduced in section 2.4.1 as variables thought to influence residents' perceptions of impacts.

Demographics

The two youngest clusters in this research are the attendees and the volunteers. Each of these clusters was also found to be positive in their perceptions of impacts, with the volunteers the most positive cluster. This research adds support to the argument that younger members of a community are likely to hold more positive perceptions of impacts (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996). This research also provides partial support for the argument that older residents hold less positive perceptions of impacts (Rothman, 1978; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Husbands, 1989). In this study, the second oldest cluster, the avoiders, with 67.9% of their members aged 55 and over, are the most negative cluster. However, the oldest cluster, the tolerators, with 99.1% of members aged 55 and older, are one of the more positive clusters. Therefore it does not follow that older residents hold less positive impacts, as there are other factors which must be taken into consideration.

One factor which helps to explain this finding is the relationship between the age of residents and their length of residence in the community. It is argued that residents who have lived in an area for long periods of time tend to have more negative perceptions of impacts (Sheldon & Var, 1984; Allen et al., 1988; Schroeder, 1992; Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Ryan & Cooper, 2004). This finding is supported by the

current research, which found the avoiders to have lived in the community for the longest time and who are the most negative.

It is argued that higher levels of education are associated with more positive perceptions of impacts (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Hernandez et al., 1996). This research supports this finding given that the tolerators and attendees are the two most highly educated clusters, and are two of the most positive clusters.

This research also provides support for the finding that a higher income is associated with more positive perceptions of impacts (Pizam, 1978; Schroeder, 1992; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996). The attendees cluster, representing the highest income earners, is one of the clusters that holds the most positive perceptions of impacts.

Being employed is another factor that is associated with more positive perceptions of impacts (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996). Employment does not have to be tourism-related, merely some form of employment. The attendees are the cluster which has the greatest percentage of its members in some form of employment (full-time, part-time and self-employment) and is one of the most positive clusters.

No relationship was found for gender or proximity to tourist activities as influencing residents' perceptions of impacts.

Identification with the Theme

It is argued that residents who identify with the theme of the event are more likely to have positive perceptions of impacts (Cegielski & Mules, 2002; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002b). In this research, the volunteers and attendees display the greatest levels of interest in the theme and hold the most positive perceptions of impacts, therefore supporting this finding.

Level of Participation

The two clusters in this research which had the highest levels of participation in the festival are the attendees and the volunteers. These two clusters also hold high positive perceptions of the impacts of the festival. This supports other studies which

have found that those residents who participate in an event are more likely to have positive perceptions of its impacts (Cegielski & Mules, 2002; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a).

Economic Dependence

It is suggested that positive perceptions are associated with a direct economic dependence on the tourism industry or a specific event (Rothman, 1978; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Schluter & Var, 1988; Schroeder, 1992; King et al., 1993; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Jurowski et al., 1997; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Weaver & Lawton, 2001). The cluster identified in this research that has occupational connections to tourism and the festival is the economically connected cluster. However, while they hold positive perceptions of the festival, they also recognise many of the negative impacts. This cluster is similar to the 'realists' cluster identified by Schroeder (1992), Madrigal (1995) and Fredline and Faulkner (2000) and is equally aware of the negative impacts which accompany the potential positives. Therefore, care should be taken not to assume that those who benefit economically from an event will hold purely positive perceptions.

5.6 Can the SIP scale be used to measure residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals?

This thesis set out to answer the question, what are the social impacts of festivals on communities? The SIP scale used in this research was successful in helping to answer this question, and represents a useful tool for measuring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. This section highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the SIP scale.

The SIP scale accesses residents' perceptions of impact occurrence and goes one step further by asking respondents to comment on the nature and level of the impact. The SIP scale asks respondents whether the impact will be positive or negative. Will it have a very small impact or a very large impact? Consequently, this provides festival organisers with information not only on which impacts residents perceive to have occurred, and those which they perceive to have not occurred, but also the

perceived nature and level of these impacts. Knowing the perception of these impacts as positive or negative, and the associated level from very small to very large, is important in identifying which impacts to encourage and which to avoid in the future hosting of an event. This allows festival organisers to make better use of limited resources by targeting identified areas of concern.

The SIP scale also allows all respondents to rate the nature and level of the impact, regardless of their perception of impact occurrence. That is, even respondents who perceive an impact not to have occurred are still able to rate the nature and level of that impact. By allowing respondents to rate impact non-occurrence, the SIP scale serves to deliver more detailed information regarding residents' perceptions of impacts. For example, the results discussed earlier show that a number of impacts perceived not to have occurred were rated as negative impacts. For example, in Hadley, respondents who disagreed that there was increased traffic saw this as having a negative impact. In other words, respondents wanted to see the increased traffic occur as a result of the festival, as this suggests busy-ness and, potentially, the success of their festival. Without this level of information, incorrect assumptions can be made regarding residents' perceptions of the impacts of a festival. The SIP scale is therefore useful in ensuring that sufficient detail is gained to allow for a complete understanding of residents' perceptions of the social impacts resulting from a festival.

By allowing respondents to rate the impacts as either positive or negative in nature, the SIP scale allows impacts to be perceived differently by different people. Rather than applying presupposed values to the impacts, the SIP scale allows respondents to have their own voice, and to say which impacts they perceive as positive and which they perceive to be negative. This represents an important move beyond the consideration of impacts as either positive or negative, and specifically allows for the fact that not all respondents will perceive an impact in the same way.

Given that the SIP scale assessed not only residents' perceptions of impact occurrence, but also the nature and level of the impacts, the scale itself is somewhat complex. While a great deal of care was taken with the design, layout and instructions for completing the SIP scale, the complexity of the scale may have presented some respondents with a challenge in completing it correctly.

Additionally, the section of the residents' perceptions questionnaire that used the SIP scale was relatively long, asking respondents to comment on 41 social impact items. This contributed to a relatively lengthy residents' perceptions questionnaire. While shortening the list of social impact items may be considered in future applications of the SIP scale, this may come at a cost in terms of the depth of information able to be obtained from respondents.

5.7 Summary

This chapter has presented discussion of the key findings of this research related to answering the overall research question ‘what is the social impact of festivals on communities?’. More specifically, this chapter discussed the results presented in chapter 4 in relation to how they answer the research questions, providing a discussion of the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals; a host community’s expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival; the distinct subgroups within a community who felt differently about a festival; the different perceptions of social impacts held by these subgroups; and the use of the SIP scale in measuring residents’ perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.

CHAPTER 6:

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

The overriding aim of this research was to answer the question: what are the social impacts of festivals on communities? In order to answer this question, the following sub-aims were addressed:

1. to identify the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals;
2. to identify a host community's expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of a festival;
3. to identify whether there are distinct subgroups within a community who differ in their feelings towards a festival;
4. to investigate whether these subgroups hold differing perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals;
5. to further develop the SIP scale as a tool for measuring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals;
6. to identify the implications of this research for the planning and management of future community festivals.

Chapter 1 introduced this research problem, while chapter 2 reviewed the relevant academic literature that played a role in the development of this thesis. Chapter 3 outlined the research design and methodology, and chapter 4 presented the results of the research. Discussion of the results was presented in chapter 5, structured around the research questions. In turn, chapter 6 concludes the thesis, discussing the implications of this research for the planning and management of future community festivals. The contributions made by this research are explored, and suggestions for further research are proposed based on the developments made in this thesis.

6.2 What are the implications of this research for the planning and management of future community festivals?

This research has a number of implications for the management of future community festivals, in respect to providing a better understanding of residents' perceptions of the social impacts a festival creates; towards better satisfying diverse community subgroups; and in relation to how festivals can be used to contribute to community wellbeing and the development of social capital.

6.2.1 A Better Understanding of Residents' Perceptions of Impacts

Understanding Variations in Perceptions and Dual Dimensions

The same impacts can be perceived as positive by some and negative by other members of a community. The implication of this for festival organisers is that care must be taken when making statements about the social impacts arising from festivals. In particular, labelling certain impacts as positive and others as negative should be avoided as this could differ for different people. Instead, organisers should seek the opinions of residents from the community, who should be responsible for rating and therefore labelling the impacts as either positive or negative. This represents a social-constructionist approach, which explicitly recognises that perceptions of reality are socially constructed by individuals, and thus there may be multiple realities within any one social setting or context (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998).

In addition to the negative impacts which residents perceived to affect themselves and their community as a whole, residents also reflected on the differential effects that the festival had on specific segments of their community, such as youth and the elderly. The implication for organisers is to consider which segments within a community may be unduly affected by a festival, and what the likely impacts on these groups may be.

Knowing that impacts can be perceived differently by different members of a community means that within any of the six social impact dimensions, there may be the presence of 'dual dimensions', in which certain impacts contribute positively to

that dimension, while other impacts contribute negatively. The implication of this for festival organisers is an understanding that the six impact dimensions are multi-faceted and that the existence of dual dimensions must be taken into consideration. That is, organisers must be aware of impacts than can enhance dimensions such as entertainment and socialisation opportunities, including the meeting of new people and spending time with family and friends, while controlling for, and being aware of impacts that residents may see as diminishing their entertainment and socialisation opportunities, such as increased ticket prices and a decrease in free street entertainment.

Understanding Residents' Qualified Responses

Residents made a number of qualifications and justifications which suggest that certain negative impacts resulting from a festival can be tolerated. However, the results also showed that there are certain types of impacts for which tolerance levels are higher, and those for which tolerance levels are lower. These findings indicate that organisers should focus attention on minimising or managing the impacts for which residents have lower levels of tolerance.

Understanding the Interrelationships between the Social Impact Dimensions

The six underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals do not exist in isolation, but rather are interrelated. This has implications for the management of these impacts as a result of a festival. For example, with the knowledge that inconvenience and personal frustration impacts are related, it can be seen that attention in one area will probably have repercussions in another. For example, if inconvenience is managed, then people are likely to be less frustrated. Similarly, there is a relationship between entertainment and socialisation opportunities and community identity and cohesion. By developing strategies that encourage the local community to attend and participate in the festival, organisers will in turn facilitate a sense of community identity and cohesion.

A consideration of these interrelationships and an understanding that targeting one dimension may impact on another dimension is necessary on the part of organisers. This involves looking beyond the immediate target and purpose behind an action towards what implications it can have in other related areas.

6.2.2 Satisfying Diverse Community Groups

The results of the cluster analysis have direct implications for festival organisers with respect to creating and marketing a festival to satisfy the diverse needs of distinct community subgroups.

The avoiders cluster, as that which holds the most negative attitudes towards the festival and has the most strongly negative perceptions of its impacts, represents the group which requires most management attention. One way to try to rectify this would be to engage the avoiders by increasing their connections with the festival. This could be through encouraging either attendance at the festival or some level of volunteer involvement. If persuaded to participate in the festival, the avoiders may personally experience some of the positive outcomes of the festival, and may therefore be more willing to tolerate some of the associated negative impacts. However, as the second oldest cluster behind the tolerators, many of the avoiders may not actually want to attend or participate in the festival. In this case, rather than trying to encourage participation, a focus on educating the avoiders, through greater promotion of the positive impacts of the festival, may foster more positive feelings within this group. Even if they don't attend, they may be less negative about the festival in the future. This would essentially move the avoiders more towards the profile of the tolerators.

The next cluster which requires attention is the economically connected cluster. This is the second most negative cluster after the avoiders. People in the economically connected cluster need to be in town during the festival weekend in order to operate their businesses, and consequently, they are subject to more of the inconvenience and personal frustration impacts than other community subgroups who do not need to be there. In addition, this cluster does not feel that they are receiving many of the positive impacts that result from the festival, such as the entertainment and socialisation opportunities. This is because the economically connected cluster are working the majority of the weekend, and therefore have little opportunity to actually attend and enjoy the festival. Therefore, the festival organisers may want to consider ways in which they can increase the involvement of this group with the festival, possibly staging an event especially for the local businesses. This could involve an exclusive performance by one of the artists appearing at the festival, held specifically

for the local businesspeople prior to the festival. Such action would celebrate the important role that the local businesses play, with an event held especially for them, at a time in which they can actually attend and enjoy it. For those in the economically connected cluster who don't feel they sufficiently benefit from the festival, the organisers could develop strategies that encourage visitors into the main street through the placement of additional festival-related activities or venues outside the current areas. Additionally, the festival organisers could provide first option to the local businesses to set up their own stalls before being offered to external businesses.

The tolerators are a group who do not necessarily attend the festival, but who are happy for it to take place in their community for the wider benefits it brings. Therefore it is suggested that no targeted action is necessary for the tolerators. Currently, this group seems happy to stay at home and let others in the community enjoy the festival.

The two most positive clusters are the volunteers and the attendees. Since they both already love the festival and perceive the impacts of the festival as overwhelmingly positive, little if anything is required to satisfy the needs of these two groups. However, in order to maintain the continued support of these two groups, the festival organisers may want to reinforce the positive aspects of the festival which these two groups value most, which include increased entertainment opportunities and having more visitors to the community. Additionally, the organisers should continue to create opportunities for members of the host community to be involved with the festival, in both volunteer and attendee capacities.

Importantly, the organisers need to be mindful that in professionalising the management of a community festival they do not lose sight of the importance of the community to the festival. In addition, such changes should be made with the input of the community, through proper community consultation processes.

6.2.3 Contributing to Community Wellbeing and Social Capital

There are a number of implications arising from this study regarding how community festivals can be used to enhance the overall wellbeing of a community and contribute to its stock of social capital.

A community festival offers wide-ranging opportunities for individuals to participate in the life of a community. These opportunities come in the form of positions on the organising committee, volunteering or attending the festival. Participation increases their sense of belonging and identity, and encourages social transactions and relationship building. By providing the environment in which these transactions and interactions can occur, a community festival plays an important role in contributing to the wellbeing of its community. Wellbeing refers to optimal quality of life within a community (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001; Beeton, 2006; Rural Assist Information Network, 2006), which at the individual level is influenced by their connections and interactions with other community members. Therefore, encouraging members of the resident population to engage with and participate in the festival is likely to have wider benefits for the wellbeing level of the community.

Community festivals facilitate the development of social capital as they enable participants to build relationships as well as develop social networks that can be of ongoing benefit to the community. By bringing together members of the community around a common interest such as the hosting of a community music festival, the outcome can be bonding between members of the group. The building of such social relationships and networks between people who hold similar interests represents the development of bonding social capital. On the other hand, bridging social capital can also result, where people from diverse backgrounds are brought together around a common cause. This is often the case with volunteer involvement, which can bring together people of different ages and genders who work together to successfully help stage a festival.

Social capital is also built as festivals contribute to positive social engagements such as opportunities for social interaction, togetherness within the community, meeting new people, shared family experiences, and opportunities for community

involvement, as experienced by festival attendees. Therefore in order to ensure that festivals are a contributor to the stock of social capital within a community, event planners and managers should be mindful of putting in place strategies to ensure that positive social transactions and interactions can occur.

Festival organisers and policy makers should also be aware that while festivals can build social capital, they can also serve to diminish the stocks of social capital within a community. Social capital can be diminished where festivals contribute to negative social transactions and social engagements such as facilitating an increase in delinquent behaviour, vandalism, crime, drinking and its impacts, violence, a strain on local resources and divisions within the community. If a festival contributes to the increased occurrence of antisocial behaviour, then festival organisers will need to work with local government to develop policies that provide a safer environment and facilities during the course of the festival. This is important not only for the safety of attendees and residents and the future success and sustainability of the festival, but to ensure that the stocks of social capital within a community are not severely diminished.

6.3 Contributions of the Study

This thesis set out to achieve a greater understanding of the social impacts of festivals on communities. In doing so, this research has a made a number of significant contributions to the body of knowledge concerning the social impacts of events.

A major contribution of this research is the further development and application of a tool for measuring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. The SIP scale, originally developed in the author's Honours research, has been further developed and applied on a larger scale in this research. The SIP scale has been tested more widely in this research, using a residents' perceptions approach. Additionally, a larger sample size enabled the use of factor analysis to identify the underlying dimensions of the social impacts of community festivals, and cluster analysis to identify distinct community subgroups that hold differing views of the festival.

A strength of the SIP scale is that it has been developed using standardised scale development procedures (DeVellis, 2003), from the initial item generation and review, through to the application of valid testing procedures for refinement of the scale. The scale items were purified using Cronbach's alpha as a measure of internal consistency, with the high alpha values suggesting a reliable scale (Coakes & Steed, 2003). Factor analysis was used as a tool for refinement of the SIP scale, the result being a psychometrically sound scale which shows six key dimensions underlying the set of social impact variables. The development of the SIP scale serves to extend the academic literature on event impact scale development, in which there has been relatively little work done. The SIP scale now represents a tool which can be used in future research to measure residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.

Another important contribution made by this research is a greater understanding of the social impacts on host communities resulting from community festivals. Factor analysis identified inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences as the six dimensions underlying the social impacts of community festivals. These findings extend the academic literature on the social impacts of events by replacing the complexity of a large range of social impact variables with a six-factor structure that summarises the social impacts resulting from community festivals. Additionally, the researcher found that these factors should not be labelled as positive or negative, due to their dual dimensions. This represents a contribution to the existing body of knowledge and makes a considered argument for a new way of looking at the social impacts of events.

This research represents a move away from traditional cluster analysis studies which segment a resident population based on their perceptions of impacts. In doing so, this research contributes to the existing literature on community segmentation studies, by supporting the use of a combination of demographics and behavioural characteristics as the basis on which members of a host community can be segmented.

An additional contribution of this research is that it highlights the need to combine both qualitative and quantitative data to gain the best understanding of the social impacts that festivals have on their host communities. Without the opportunity for respondents to provide open-ended (qualitative) responses, important issues of concern to the community, as reflected in the 'community-identified' impacts, would not have been identified. This stresses the importance of actually asking the community about what impacts the festival has on them, rather than using only a predetermined set of impact items. This supports the findings of Reid (2006) who argues that the use of a predefined social impact scale "does not allow for residents to expand upon certain issues that they perceive as resulting from an event". This research therefore supports the use of a generic social impact scale, but recognises that this needs to be in combination with a qualitative approach which ensures that the affected community is sufficiently able to communicate additional impacts which have not been addressed within the scale provided.

Importantly, this research contributes to the theoretical development of the events field as it provides a deeper understanding of how festivals contribute to community wellbeing and the development of social capital, by encouraging the participation of the local community in the organisation and attendance of a festival.

The findings from this research not only advance theory in the events field, but have practical use in the planning and management of future festivals. The identification of the perceived positive and negative social impacts can assist festival organisers to better manage a festival by putting strategies in place to capitalise on positive social impacts, and minimise negative social impacts. By identifying subgroups within the community who feel differently about a festival, this research has implications for event organisers in understanding and targeting the needs and concerns of diverse community subgroups.

6.4 Suggestions for Further Research

There are a number of ways in which this research can be advanced in future studies. Ideally, the SIP scale should be further developed and tested in future empirical research. Future applications of the SIP scale to different types of community

festivals and events will enable research on measuring the social impacts of community festivals to be advanced. The SIP scale could be tested by applying it to festivals with very different themes and inherent appeal to a resident population. This will allow for greater generalisability of research findings to a wider range of community festivals. It is not expected, however, that the items that make up the SIP scale will be generic for all festivals. On the contrary, it will be necessary to select the range of social impacts that are specific and relevant to the community under study.

Given the valuable addition that the qualitative data made to achieving a more in-depth understanding of residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals, it is recommended that future research incorporate a qualitative dimension. This should involve asking the community about the impacts which affect them, and incorporating them as items into the SIP scale or using them as additional supporting data.

Continued applications of the SIP scale will serve to identify any similarities or differences in the underlying dimensions of social impacts resulting from community festivals across different communities. The six dimensions identified in this research can be tested for their existence and comprehensiveness in summarising the social impacts of community festivals. It is important to note, however, that the factors can only be derived from and be representative of the initial set of items from which they were extracted. So where different studies use a different range of impact items, the resulting factors are likely to differ for this reason.

This research has highlighted that the SIP scale provides useful information for festival organisers, given that the scale accesses not only respondents' perceptions of impact occurrence but also information regarding the type and level of impact this has on them. It would be useful for further research to adopt a longitudinal perspective using the SIP scale to allow changes in social impacts to be charted over time as successive studies are undertaken on the same festival. This would allow the measurement of changes in residents' perceptions of impacts over time, and also an investigation of whether event organisers incorporate feedback from the SIP scale

into event planning processes, and how useful the information is for developing future strategies.

Further research into the role of community festivals in contributing to community wellbeing and the development of social capital is required. This would likely be in-depth qualitative research, which could investigate the social capital outcomes stemming from the organisation and staging of a community festival.

Using a combination of demographics and behavioural characteristics, this research identified five distinct community subgroups who each feel differently about a festival. It is recommended that future segmentation studies in the events field adopt a similar clustering approach, in order to test whether similar clusters are identified in other communities and in relation to events of a different size and theme. Additionally, intensive research on the identified clusters could be undertaken to more deeply understand a clusters feelings towards the festival and their perceptions of its social impacts. Such intensive research could focus on identifying what action is required to change the way the clusters feel, for example, to make them more positive towards or participative in the festival. Also, a longitudinal perspective would allow for changes in community subgroups to be charted over time. Would these subgroups themselves, or maybe their size, change over time, as successive festivals are held in the host community?

A finding of this research is that residents are willing to tolerate a certain level of negative impacts, because of the other perceived benefits they receive from the hosting of a festival in their community. However, there are other related questions that still remain unanswered and as such represent issues for further investigation, questions such as when is a community's capacity to tolerate negative impacts surpassed? What makes some communities more tolerant than others? Future research will be required to understand these important issues in more depth.

6.5 Conclusion

In summary, a number of conclusions can be drawn from this study of the social impacts of festival on communities. This research shows that community festivals create a number of social impacts which affect the host community, which can be

summarised under six dimensions: inconvenience, community identity and cohesion, personal frustration, entertainment and socialisation opportunities, community growth and development, and behavioural consequences. Impacts within each of these categories can be perceived either positively or negatively by different members of the community. This supports the argument that social impacts should not be pre-defined as positive or negative, but that the affected community members should be responsible for making that judgement. This study has reached the conclusion that the SIP scale represents a useful tool for measuring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals. Importantly, it allows residents to decide whether a range of impacts has a positive or negative affect on them.

This research provides support for viewing communities as heterogeneous, identifying five distinct community subgroups: tolerators, economically connected, attendees, avoiders and volunteers. Each of these represents a subgroup of the population who expresses a particular feeling towards the festival, different from that expressed by any other subgroup. This finding has implications for event organisers in understanding and targeting the needs and concerns of diverse community subgroups.

This research has also concluded that community festivals play an important role in achieving wellbeing outcomes for the community, including the development of social capital. These outcomes should be managed to ensure that a festival contributes to positive social transactions and engagements between members of the host community.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D., Kumar, V., & Day, G. (2004). *Marketing research*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1998). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 79-109). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Ahlbrandt, R. S., & Cunningham, J. V. (1979). *A new public policy for neighbourhood preservation*. New York: Praeger.

Allen, J., O'Toole, W., McDonnell, I., & Harris, R. (2005). *Festival and special event management* (3rd ed.). Milton, Queensland: John Wiley and Sons Australia, Ltd.

Allen, L. R., Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life. *Journal of Travel Research, 27*(1), 16-21.

Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(4), 1056-1076.

Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: the case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research, 42*(2), 172-185.

Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 610-616.

Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 19*(4), 665-690.

Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1998). Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. *Journal of Travel Research, 37*(2), 120-131.

Archer, B., & Cooper, C. (1994). The positive and negative impacts of tourism. In W. Theobald (Ed.), *Global tourism: the next decade* (pp. 73-91). Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Arcodia, C., & Robb, A. (2000). *A future for event management: a taxonomy of event management terms.* In J. Allen, R. Harris, L. Jago & A. J. Veal (Eds.), Events Beyond 2000: Setting the Agenda, Proceedings of Conference on Event

Evaluation, Research and Education (pp. 154-160). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management, School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism, University of Technology Sydney.

Arimond, G., & Elfessi, A. (2001). A clustering method for categorical data in tourism market segmentation research. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*(4), 391-397.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2000). Measuring social capital: current collections and future directions. Retrieved March 30, 2005, from http://www.abs.gov.au/852563C30080E02A/0/6CD8B1F3F270566ACA25699F0015A02A?Open

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2001). Measuring wellbeing: frameworks for Australian social statistics (ABS Catalogue No. 4160.0). Retrieved March 30, 2005, from http://www.ausstats.abs.gov.au/ausstats

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2002a). AusStats: 2001 Census basic community profile and snapshot (510200840 Bridgetown-Greenbushes Statistical Local Area). Retrieved August 30, 2005, from http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2002b). AusStats: 2001 Census basic community profile and snapshot (210106080 Queenscliffe Statistical Local Area). Retrieved August 30, 2005, from http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2002c). *Measuring social capital: discussion summary and next steps*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2002d). *Social capital and social wellbeing*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2004). AusStats: Regional Population Growth, Australia and New Zealand, 2003-04 (ABS cat. no. 3218.0). Retrieved August 30, 2005, from http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2006). Aspects of social capital (ABS Catalogue No. 4911.0). Retrieved November 2, 2005, from http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats

Banks, S., Butcher, H., Henderson, P., & Robertson, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Managing community practice: principles, policies and programmes*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Bazeley, P., & Richards, L. (2000). *The NVivo qualitative project book*. London: Sage Publications.

Beeton, S. (2006). *Community development through tourism*. Collingwood: Landlinks Press.

Belislie, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents: a case study in Santa Marta, Colombia. *Annals of Tourism Research, 7*(1), 83-101.

Bell, C., & Newby, H. (1971). *Community studies: an introduction to the sociology of the local community*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Bernard, J. (1973). *The sociology of community*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Bowdin, G. A. J., Allen, J., O'Toole, W., Harris, R., & McDonnell, I. (2006). *Events management* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Elsevier.

Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (2006). *Foundations of multimethod research: synthesizing styles*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Brougham, J. E., & Butler, R. W. (1981). A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes to the social impact of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 8*(4), 569-587.

Brown, S., & James, J. (2004). Event design and management: ritual sacrifice? In I. Yeoman, M. Robertson, J. Ali-Knight, S. Drummond & U. McMahon-Beattie (Eds.), *Festival and events management: an international arts and culture perspective* (pp. 53-64). Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(3), 493-515.

Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burns, J. P. A., Hatch, J. H., & Mules, T. J. (1986). *The Adelaide Grand Prix: the impact of a special event*. Adelaide: The Centre for South Australian Economic Studies.

Butcher, H. (1993). Introductions: some examples and definitions. In H. Butcher, A. Glen, P. Henderson & J. Smith (Eds.), *Community and public policy* (pp. 3-21). London: Pluto Press.

Cegielski, M., & Mules, T. (2002). Aspects of residents' perceptions of the GMC 400 - Canberra's V8 Supercar Race. *Current Issues in Tourism, 5*(1), 54-70.

Chen, J. S. (2000). An investigation of urban residents' loyalty to tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 24*(1), 5-19.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1992). Notes on pragmatism and scientific realism. *Educational Researcher, 21*(6), 13-17.

Child, D. (1970). *The essentials of factor analysis*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Christakopoulou, S., Dawson, J., & Gari, A. (2001). The community well-being questionnaire: theoretical context and initial assessment of its reliability and validity. *Social Indicators Research, 56*, 321-351.

Coakes, S. J., & Steed, L. G. (2003). *SPSS analysis without anguish: version 11.0*. Milton, Queensland: John Wiley and Sons.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Crandall, L. (1994). The social impact of tourism on developing regions and its measurement. In B. J. R. Ritchie & C. R. Goeldner (Eds.), *Travel, tourism and hospitality research: a handbook for managers and researchers* (2nd ed., pp. 413-423). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Crompton, J. L., Lee, S., & Shuster, T. J. (2001). A guide for undertaking economic impact studies: the Springfest example. *Journal of Travel Research, 40*(1), 79-87.

Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(2), 425-439.

Crow, G., & Allan, G. (1994). *Community life: an introduction to local social relations*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Cullen, M., & Whiteford, H. (2001). *The interrelations of social capital with health and mental health: discussion paper*. Canberra: Mental Health and Special Programs Branch, Commonwealth of Australia.

Cuthill, M. (2002). Coolangatta: a portrait of community well-being. *Urban Policy and Research, 20*(2), 187-203.

Davis, D., Allen, J., & Cosenza, R. M. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests and opinions toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 27*(2), 2-8.

De Bres, K., & Davis, J. (2001). Celebrating group and place identity: a case study of a new regional festival. *Tourism Geographies, 3*(3), 326-337.

Delamere, T. A. (1997). Development of scale items to measure the social impact of community festivals. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 22*(4), 293-315.

Delamere, T. A. (2001). Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, part II: verification of the scale. *Event Management, 7*, 25-38.

Delamere, T. A., & Hinch, T. (1994). Community festivals: celebration or sellout? *Recreation Canada, 52*(1), 26-29.

Delamere, T. A., Wankel, L. M., & Hinch, T. D. (2001). Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, part I: item generation and purification of the measure. *Event Management, 7*, 11-24.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1998). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. California: Sage Publications.

Derrett, R. (2000). *Can festivals brand community cultural development and cultural tourism simultaneously?* In J. Allen, R. Harris, L. Jago & A. J. Veal (Eds.), Events Beyond 2000: Setting the Agenda, Proceedings of Conference on Event Evaluation, Research and Education (pp. 120-129). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management, School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism, University of Technology Sydney.

Derrett, R. (2003). Making sense of how festivals demonstrate a community's sense of place. *Event Management, 8*, 49-58.

Derrett, R. (2004). Festivals, events and the destination. In I. Yeoman, M. Robertson, J. Ali-Knight, S. Drummond & U. McMahon-Beattie (Eds.), *Festival and*

events management: an international arts and culture perspective (pp. 32-50). Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: theory and applications* (2nd ed. Vol. 26). California: Sage Publications.

Diaz-Martin, A. M., Iglesias, V., Vazquez, R., & Ruiz, A. V. (2000). The use of quality expectations to segment a service market. *Journal of Services Marketing, 14*(2), 132-146.

Dimmock, K., & Tiyce, M. (2001). Festivals and events: celebrating special interest tourism. In N. Douglas, N. Douglas & R. Derrett (Eds.), *Special interest tourism* (pp. 355-383). Milton, Queensland: John Wiley and Sons Australia.

Doxey, G. V. (1975). *A causation theory of visitor resident irritants: methodology and research inferences.* In Travel and Tourism Research Association Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings (pp. 57-72). San Diego: Travel Research Association.

Duffy, M. (2006). *Participants and their experiences of events.* In G. B. O'Mahony & P. A. Whitelaw (Eds.), *CAUTHE 2006 "to the city and beyond…". Proceedings of the 16th Annual CAUTHE Conference*. Melbourne: Victoria University, Melbourne.

Durkheim, E. (1995). *The elementary forms of religious life* (K. E. Fields, Trans.). New York: The Free Press.

Dwyer, L., Mellor, R., Mistilis, N., & Mules, T. (2000). A framework for assessing "tangible" and "intangible" impacts of events and conventions. *Event Management, 6*, 175-189.

Edwards, D. (2005). It's mostly about me: reasons why volunteers contribute their time to museums and art museums. *Tourism Review International, 9*(1), 1-11.

Falk, I., & Kilpatrick, S. (2000). What is social capital? A study of interaction in a rural community. *European Society for Rural Sociology, 40*(1), 87-110.

Faulkner, B., & Tideswell, C. (1997). A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 5*(1), 3-28.

Ford, K. J., MacCallum, R. C., & Tait, M. (1986). The application of exploratory factor analysis in applied psychology: a critical review and analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 39*, 291-314.

Fredline, E. (2000). *Host community reactions to major sporting events: the Gold Coast Indy and the Australian Formula One Grand Prix in Melbourne.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Griffith University, Gold Coast.

Fredline, E., Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2005). *Testing of a compressed generic instrument to assess host community perceptions of events: a case study of the Australian Open Tennis Tournament.* In J. Allen (Ed.), The Impacts of Events, Proceedings of the International Event Management Research Conference (pp. 158-177). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management, University of Technology, Sydney.

Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (1998). Resident reactions to a major tourist event: the Gold Coast Indy Car Race. *Festival Management and Event Tourism, 5*, 185-205.

Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Host community reactions: a cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(3), 763-784.

Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (2002a). Residents' reactions to the staging of major motorsport events within their communities: a cluster analysis. *Event Management, 7*, 103-114.

Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (2002b). Variations in residents' reactions to major motorsport events: why residents perceive the impacts of events differently. *Event Management, 7*, 115-125.

Fredline, E., Jago, L., & Deery, M. (2003). The development of a generic scale to measure the social impacts of events. *Event Management, 8*, 23-37.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: the social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: The Free Press.

Gardner, J. (2005). *Factor analysis and principal component analysis: concepts, application and interpretation. Course Notes*: ACSPRI Winter Program.

Garson, D. (2004a). Syllabus for PA 765: quantitative research in public administration - cluster analysis. Retrieved September 22, 2006, from http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/cluster.htm

Garson, D. (2004b). Syllabus for PA 765: quantitative research in public administration - factor analysis. Retrieved July 26, 2005, from http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/factor.htm

Getz, D. (1989). Special events: defining the product. *Tourism Management, 10*(2), 125-137.

Getz, D. (1991). *Festivals, special events and tourism*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Getz, D. (1995). Special events. In S. Medlik (Ed.), *Managing tourism* (pp. 122-130). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Getz, D. (1997). *Event management and event tourism*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.

Getz, D., & Frisby, W. (1988). Evaluating management effectiveness in community-run festivals. *Journal of Travel Research, 27*(1), 22-27.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. London: Continuum.

Glasson, J., Godfrey, K., & Goodey, B. (1995). *Towards visitor impact management: visitor impacts, carrying capacity and management responses in Europe's historic towns and cities*. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Godfrey, K., & Clarke, J. (2000). *The tourism development handbook: a practical approach to planning and marketing*. London: Cassell.

Goldblatt, J. (2000). *A future for event management: the analysis of major trends impacting the emerging profession.* In J. Allen, R. Harris, L. Jago & A. J. Veal (Eds.), Events Beyond 2000: Setting the Agenda, Proceedings of Conference on Event Evaluation, Research and Education (pp. 2-9). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management, School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism, University of Technology Sydney.

Goodrick, D., & Emmerson, G. (2004). *Using mixed methods in research and program evaluation*: ACSPRI Workshop Notes.

Goodson, L., & Phillimore, J. (2004). The inquiry paradigm in qualitative tourism research. In J. Phillimore & L. Goodson (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (pp. 30-45). London: Routledge.

Greene, J. C., Kreider, H., & Mayer, E. (2005). Combining qualitative and quantitative methods in social inquiry. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin (Eds.), *Research methods in the social sciences* (pp. 274-281). London: Sage Publications.

Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: a structural modelling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(1), 79-105.

Gursoy, D., Kim, K., & Uysal, M. (2004). Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organizers: an extension and validation. *Tourism Management, 25*, 171-181.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hair, J. F., & Black, W. C. (2000). Cluster analysis. In L. G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding more multivariate statistics* (pp. 147-205). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hall, C. M. (1989). Hallmark events and the planning process. In G. J. Syme, B. J. Shaw, D. M. Fenton & W. S. Mueller (Eds.), *The planning and evaluation of hallmark events* (pp. 20-39). Aldershot, England: Avebury.

Hall, C. M. (1993). *Hallmark tourist events: impacts, management and planning*. London: Belhaven Press.

Hall, C. M. (2003). *Introduction to tourism: dimensions and issues* (4th ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia.

Hall, C. M., & Hodges, J. (1996). The party's great, but what about the hangover?: the housing and social impacts of mega-events with special reference to the 2000 Sydney Olympics. *Festival Management and Event Tourism, 4*, 13-20.

Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: the case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23*(3), 503-526.

Harper, R. (2001). *Social capital: a review of the literature*. UK: Office for National Statistics.

Hernandez, S. A., Cohen, J., & Garcia, H. L. (1996). Residents' attitudes towards an instant resort enclave. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23*(4), 755-779.

Higham, J. E. S., & Ritchie, B. (2001). The evolution of festivals and other events in rural Southern New Zealand. *Event Management, 7*, 39-49.

Hodder, I. (1998). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 110-129). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Hunt, S. D., Sparkman, R. D., & Wilcox, J. B. (1982). The pretest in survey research: issues and preliminary findings. *Journal of Marketing Research, 19*, 269-273.

Husbands, W. (1989). Social status and perception of tourism in Zambia. *Annals of Tourism Research, 16*, 237-253.

Ife, J., & Tesoriero, F. (2006). *Community development: community-based alternatives in an age of globalisation* (3rd ed.). Frenchs Forest, New South Wales: Pearson Education Australia.

Inbakaran, R., & Jackson, M. (2005a). Marketing regional tourism: how better to target and address community attitudes to tourism. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 11*(4), 323-339.

Inbakaran, R., & Jackson, M. (2005b). Understanding resort visitors through segmentation. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 6*(1), 53-71.

Insightful Corporation. (2001). *S-PLUS 6 for Windows: guide to statistics, volume 2*. Seattle: Insightful Corporation.

Inskeep, E. (1991). *Tourism planning: an integrated and sustainable development approach*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Jackson, M. S., & Inbakaran, R. J. (2006). Evaluating residents' attitudes and intentions to act towards tourism development in regional Victoria, Australia. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 8*, 355-366.

Jago, L., Chalip, L., Brown, G., Mules, T., & Ali, S. (2003). Building events into destination branding: insights from experts. *Event Management, 8*, 3-14.

Jago, L. K., Chalip, L., Brown, G., Mules, T., & Ali, S. (2002). *The role of events in helping to brand a destination.* In L. Jago, M. Deery, R. Harris, A. Hede & J. Allen (Eds.), Events and Place Making, Proceedings of the International Event Research Conference (pp. 111-143). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management, University of Technology, Sydney.

Jago, L. K., & Shaw, R. N. (1998). Special events: a conceptual and definitional framework. *Festival Management and Event Tourism, 5*, 21-32.

Jennings, G. (2001). *Tourism research*. Milton, Queensland: John Wiley and Sons.

Johnson, J. D., Snepenger, D. J., & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' perceptions of tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(3), 629-642.

Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 36*(2), 3-11.

Kachigan, S. K. (1986). *Statistical analysis: an interdisciplinary introduction to univariate and multivariate methods*. New York: Radius Press.

Kang, Y., Long, P. T., & Perdue, R. R. (1996). Resident attitudes toward legal gambling. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23*(1), 71-85.

Kayat, K. (2002). Power, social exchanges and tourism in Langkawi: rethinking resident perceptions. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 4*, 171-191.

Keogh, B. (1990). Public participation in community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(3), 449-465.

Kim, S. S., & Petrick, J. F. (2005). Residents' perceptions on impacts of the FIFA 2002 World Cup: the case of Seoul as host city. *Tourism Management, 26*, 25-38.

King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*(4), 650-665.

Korca, P. (1996). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23*(3), 695-697.

Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(1), 121-139.

Leonard, R., & Onyx, J. (2003). Networking through loose and strong ties: an Australian qualitative study. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 14*(2), 189-203.

Leonard, R., & Onyx, J. (2004). *Social capital and community building: spinning straw into gold*. London: Janus Publishing Company.

Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research, 13*, 193-214.

Local Government Community Services Association of Australia. (1999). *Working together to develop our communities: good practice and benchmarking in Local Government community development and community services*. Townsville: Local Government Community Services Association of Australia.

Madrigal, R. (1995). Residents' perceptions and the role of government. *Annals of Tourism Research, 22*(1), 86-102.

Marshall, P., Kelder, J., & Perry, A. (2005). *Social constructionism with a twist of pragmatism: a suitable cocktail for Information Systems research*. Paper presented at the 16th Australasian Conference on Information Systems.

Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: economic, physical and social impacts*. Essex, England: Longman Group Limited.

Mayfield, T. L., & Crompton, J. L. (1995). Development of an instrument for identifying community reasons for staging a festival. *Journal of Travel Research, 33*(3), 37-44.

McCann, C., & Thompson, G. (1992). An economic analysis of the First Western Australian State Masters Games. *The Journal of Tourism Studies, 3*(1), 28-34.

McCool, S. F., & Martin, S. R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research, 32*(3), 29-34.

McDaniel, C., & Gates, R. (2007). *Marketing research* (7th ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.

McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*, 131-140.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: a qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Mill, R. C., & Morrison, A. M. (1998). *The tourism system: an introductory text* (3rd ed.). Iowa, USA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on Central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*(2), 191-204.

Molloy, J. (2002). Regional festivals: a look at community support, the isolation factor and funding sources. *The Journal of Tourism Studies, 13*(2), 2-15.

Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Moscovici, S. (1981). On social representations. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Social cognition: perspectives on everyday understanding* (pp. 181-209). London: Academic Press.

Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: a community approach*. London: Methuen.

Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (6th ed.). Boston, USA: Pearson Education.

Norusis, M. J. (2005). *SPSS 13.0 statistical procedures companion*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Norusis, M. J. (2006). SPSS statistics guides. Retrieved October 5, 2006, from http://www.norusis.com/pdf/SPC_v13.pdf

Onyx, J., & Bullen, P. (2000). Sources of social capital. In I. Winter (Ed.), *Social capital and public policy in Australia* (pp. 105-135). Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (2nd ed.). Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen and Unwin.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*, 586-599.

Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: the social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research, 16*(4), 8-12.

Poplin, D. E. (1979). *Communities: a survey of theories and methods of research* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Productivity Commission. (2003). *Social capital: reviewing the concept and its policy implications* (Research Paper). Canberra: AusInfo.

Punj, G., & Stewart, D. W. (1983). Cluster analysis in marketing research: review and suggestions for application. *Journal of Marketing Research, 20*, 134-148.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rao, V. (2001). Celebrations as social investments: festival expenditures, unit price variation and social status in rural India. *The Journal of Development Studies, 38*(1), 71-97.

Recker, J. (2006). *Towards an understanding of process model quality: methodological considerations.* In J. Ljungberg & M. Andersson (Eds.), 14th European Conference on Information Systems Goeteborg, Sweden.

Reid, S. (2004). *The social consequences of rural events: the Inglewood Olive Festival.* In C. Cooper, C. Arcodia, D. Solnet & M. Whitford (Eds.), Creating Tourism Knowledge. Proceedings of the 2004 CAUTHE Conference (pp. 607-621). Brisbane: The University of Queensland, Brisbane.

Reid, S. (2006). *Social consequences of rural events: developing knowledge, aiding planning.* In New Frontiers in Global Tourism - Trends and Competitive Challenges, Proceedings of the TTRA 37th Annual Conference (pp. 184-193). Dublin, Ireland.

Ritchie, J. R. B. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research, 23*(1), 2-11.

Ritchie, J. R. B., & Lyons, M. (1990). Olympulse VI: a post-event assessment of resident reaction to the XV Olympic Winter Games. *Journal of Travel Research, 28*(3), 14-23.

Ritchie, J. R. B., & Lyons, M. M. (1987). Olympulse III/Olympulse IV: a mid-term report on resident attitudes concerning the XV Olympic Winter Games. *Journal of Travel Research, 26*(1), 18-26.

Rojek, C. (2005). *Leisure theory: principles and practices*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ross, G. F. (1992). Resident perceptions of the impact of tourism on an Australian city. *Journal of Travel Research, 30*(3), 13-18.

Rothman, R. A. (1978). Residents and transients: community reaction to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research, 16*(3), 8-13.

Rural Assist Information Network. (2006). Community Wellbeing. Retrieved December 23, 2006, from http://www.rain.net.au/community_wellbeing.htm

Ryan, C., & Cooper, C. (2004). Residents' perceptions of tourism development: the case of Raglan, New Zealand. *Tourism Review International, 8,* 1-15.

Ryan, C., & Harvey, K. (2000). Who likes saltwater crocodiles? Analysing socio-demographics of those viewing tourist wildlife attractions based on saltwater crocodiles. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 8*(5), 426-433.

Ryan, C., & Montgomery, D. (1994). The attitudes of Bakewell residents to tourism and issues in community responsive tourism. *Tourism Management, 15*(5), 358-369.

Schluter, R., & Var, T. (1988). Resident attitudes toward tourism in Argentina. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*(3), 442-445.

Schroeder, T. (1992). Host community perceptions of tourism's impacts: a cluster analysis. *Visions in Leisure and Business, 10*(4), 43-48.

Schuller, T., Baron, S., & Field, J. (2000). Social capital: a review and critique. In S. Baron, J. Field & T. Schuller (Eds.), *Social capital: critical perspectives* (pp. 1-38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheldon, P., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management, 15*(5), 40-47.

Small, K. (2002). *Evaluating the socio-cultural impacts of a festival on a host community: a case study of the Australian Festival of the Book.* Unpublished Honours thesis, University of Western Sydney, Sydney.

Small, K., & Edwards, D. (2003). *Evaluating the socio-cultural impacts of a festival on a host community: a case study of the Australian Festival of the Book.* In T. Griffin & R. Harris (Eds.), Proceedings of the 9th Annual Conference of the Asia Pacific Tourism Association (pp. 580-593). Sydney: School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism, University of Technology, Sydney.

Small, K., & Edwards, D. (2006). *Residents' expectations and perceptions of the social impacts of community festivals.* In G. Papageorgiou (Ed.), Proceedings of the Cutting Edge Research in Tourism Conference, "New Directions, Challenges and Applications" UK: University of Surrey, Guildford.

Small, K., Edwards, D., & Sheridan, L. (2005). A flexible framework for evaluating the socio-cultural impacts of a small festival. *International Journal of Event Management Research, 1*(1), 66-77.

Somekh, B., & Lewin, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: Sage Publications.

Soutar, G. N., & McLeod, P. B. (1993). Residents' perceptions on impact of the America's Cup. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*, 571-582.

Sparkes, A. C. (1992). The paradigms debate: an extended review and a celebration of difference. In A. C. Sparkes (Ed.), *Research in physical education and sport: exploring alternative visions* (pp. 9-60). London: The Falmer Press.

Sproule, W. (2006). Content analysis. In M. Walter (Ed.), *Social research methods: an Australian perspective* (pp. 113-133). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

SPSS. (2006). SPSS: data analysis. Retrieved November 5, 2006, from http://www.spss.com/spss/data_analysis.htm

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper Collins.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: combining qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Taylor, M. (2003). *Public policy in the community*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: a guidebook and resource* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Teye, V., Sonmez, S. F., & Sirakaya, E. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(3), 668-688.

Thomas, K. (2004). The research process as a journey: from positivist traditions into the realms of qualitative inquiry. In J. Phillimore & L. Goodson (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (pp. 197-214). London: Routledge.

Thompson, B. (2004). *Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis: understanding concepts and applications*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: a comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(1), 231-253.

Turner, V. (1982). Introduction. In V. Turner (Ed.), *Celebration: studies in festivity and ritual*. Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Twynam, G. D., & Johnston, M. (2004). Changes in host community reactions to a special sporting event. *Current Issues in Tourism, 7*(3), 242-261.

Tyrrell, T. J., & Johnston, R. J. (2001). A framework for assessing direct economic impacts of tourist events: distinguishing origins, destinations, and causes of expenditures. *Journal of Travel Research, 40*(1), 94-100.

Van Der Wagen, L., & Carlos, B. R. (2005). *Event management for tourism, cultural, business, and sporting events*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Veal, A. J. (2006). *Research methods for leisure and tourism: a practical guide* (3rd ed.). Harlow, Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Waitt, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(1), 194-215.

Walliman, N. (2006). *Social research methods*. London: Sage Publications.

Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(2), 439-458.

Wicks, A. C., & Freeman, R. E. (1998). Organization studies and the new pragmatism: positivism, anti-positivism, and the search for ethics. *Organization Science, 9*(2), 123-140.

Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and residents opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(2), 269-290.

Willis, K. (2006). Analysing qualitative data. In M. Walter (Ed.), *Social research methods: an Australian perspective* (pp. 257-279). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Willmott, P. (1986). *Social networks, informal care and public policy*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Willmott, P. (1989). *Community initiatives: patterns and prospects*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Winter, I. (2000a). Major themes and debates in the social capital literature: the Australian connection. In I. Winter (Ed.), *Social capital and public policy in Australia* (pp. 17-42). Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Winter, I. (Ed.). (2000b). *Social capital and public policy in Australia*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Yarra Ranges Shire Council. (2006). Community Well-Being Plan. Retrieved December 19, 2006, from http://www.yarraranges.vic.gov.au/Files/Community_Wellbeing_Plan_2002-05.pdf

Zikmund, W. G. (2000). *Exploring marketing research* (7th ed.). Fort Worth, USA: The Dryden Press, Harcourt College Publishers.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Semi-structured Interview Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

TITLE: Evaluating Residents' Perceptions of the Social Impacts of Community Festivals

INVESTIGATOR: Katie Small, PhD Candidate in the School of Management, University of Western Sydney

Dear Participant,

This is an invitation to take part in some important research being conducted on your community. I am conducting a study on the perceived social impacts that may result from the staging of a community festival. Festivals have been identified as one of the fastest growing forms of leisure and tourism activities, their appeal resting in the uniqueness and festive ambience they provide. Festivals can have a number of significant social impacts on a community, and I am keen to explore those impacts that the Hadley Music Festival may have on residents within Hadley.

This research will provide festival organisers and stakeholders with a deeper understanding of issues that may be of concern to the broader community. Such information will enable festival organisers to better plan and manage their festival in the future by minimising negative social impacts and capitalizing on positive social impacts as valued by the community.

In addition to identifying residents' perceptions of the social impacts of the Hadley Music Festival, this study also seeks to gain information from those who are involved in the planning and management of the festival. I would be grateful if you would agree to take part in this study by answering questions on the organisation of the festival, stakeholder and community participation and the social impacts of the festival in an interview of approximately one hour's duration.

The study is conducted to meet requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy (Management) under the supervision of Dr Gregory Teal and Mrs Deborah Edwards of the School of Management at the University of Western Sydney.

Your participation is entirely voluntary and your anonymity will be protected by your not being identified in any raw data or in any written reports. The interview will be taped for analysis purposes only.

I would be grateful if you would agree to take part in this study by signing the attached consent statement. Signing this form will be regarded as consent to use the information for research purposes.

Semi-Structured Interview Participation Consent Form

I (the participant) have had an opportunity to review the Information sheet and understand that my participation is voluntary and that I agree to participate in the semi-structured interview, knowing I can withdraw at any time. I understand that I will be audio taped for analysis purposes only. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

Participant's name:

…… (print)

Participant's signature:

…… **Date: ……**

Investigator's name: Katie Small

Should you have any questions, or require clarification of any aspect regarding your involvement in the study, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone 0418869226 or email k.small@uws.edu.au. Alternatively, you may contact one of my supervisors; Greg Teal on (02) 46203247 or Deborah Edwards on (02) 46203518.

Thank you,

Katie Small

NOTE: This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC 04/102). If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Research Ethics Officers (tel: 02 4570 1136). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Appendix 2: Residents' Perceptions Questionnaire

THIS IS INDEPENDENT PHD RESEARCH BEING UNDERTAKEN THROUGH THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN SYDNEY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE HADLEY MUSIC FESTIVAL

A Survey Questionnaire

Your completion of this questionnaire is greatly appreciated.

On completion, please return in the postage paid envelope provided.

Your completion of this questionnaire will be taken as consent to participate in this study.

If you have any questions regarding this questionnaire or the study please contact:

Katie Small on Ph: (02) 4620 3281 Mob: 0418869226 Email: k.small@uws.edu.au.
Mail address: University of Western Sydney, School of Management, Campbelltown, Building 17, Level 2, Locked Bag 1797, Penrith South DC, NSW 1797

NOTE: This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC 04/102). If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Research Ethics Officers (tel: 02 4570 1136). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully and you will be informed of the outcome.

MEASURING THE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF THE HADLEY MUSIC FESTIVAL

Festivals are known to have a range of social impacts on the host communities in which they are being held. Social impacts include impacts on the day-to-day quality of life of local residents, changes to their lifestyle, values, social interactions and identity. This questionnaire seeks your opinions on a range of social impacts that may result from the hosting of the Hadley Music Festival. Your participation will ensure that findings reflect your views. All information will be treated in strict confidence and will only be used in combination with other responses from the community. Questions are printed on both sides of each page. Please make sure you respond to all questions.

SECTION A: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS AND INITIAL EXPECTATIONS

This section contains four questions that seek to find out your general perceptions and initial expectations regarding the social impacts of the Hadley Music Festival.

1. What is the first word that comes into your mind when you think of the Hadley Music Festival? (Just one word please)

_____

2a. Thinking back, please explain in your own words how you *expected* the staging of the Hadley Music Festival to affect *your* life?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2b. Was your life affected in this way? Please comment.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3a. Thinking back, please state what you *expected* the positive social impacts of the Hadley Music Festival to be.

3b. In your opinion, have these positive social impacts occurred? Please comment.

4a. Thinking back, please state what you *expected* the negative social impacts of the Hadley Music Festival to be.

4b. In your opinion, have these negative social impacts occurred? Please comment.

SECTION B: IMPACT STATEMENTS

This section seeks your opinions on the social impacts that the hosting of the 2004 Hadley Music Festival had on the local community. Please read the statements on the following pages and answer, ***in your opinion***, how you feel they impacted on the local community. Each question asks for **your opinion** on a statement, and as such, it is important to note that **there are no right or wrong answers**.

Please answer the questions on the following pages by:

1) Answering if the impact, in your opinion, occurred by circling Y (for YES), N (for NO) or DON'T KNOW.
2) If you answer either YES or NO, please indicate on the scale from -5 to +5 the level of impact you believe it had on the community, where -5 represents a *very large negative impact* and +5 represents a *very large positive impact.* The numbers are not labelled in the questionnaire, so refer to the scale below if you wish to check their meaning.
3) If you answer DON'T KNOW, please move directly onto the next question.

EXAMPLE:

Impact Statement	**Impact Occurrence**	**Level of Impact**
Festivals make life in my community more interesting.	(Y) N DON'T KNOW	-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 (+4) +5

The -5 to +5 scale represents the following values:

NEGATIVE IMPACTS ← → POSITIVE IMPACTS

-5 = very large negative impact	-4 = large negative impact	-3 = moderate negative impact	-2 = small negative impact	-1 = very small negative impact	0 = neutral	+1 = very small positive impact	+2 = small positive impact	+3 = moderate positive impact	+4 = large positive impact	+5 = very large positive impact

SECTION B: IMPACT STATEMENTS CONTINUED...

				Very Large Negative Impact						Neutral Impact				Very Large Positive Impact
1. The festival provided local residents with the opportunity to meet new people from outside the community.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
2. During the festival there were increased entertainment opportunities for the local community.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
3. The festival provided opportunities for social interaction with other members of the community.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
4. The festival provided opportunities for shared family experiences.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
5. The festival provided local residents with increased opportunities for cultural experiences.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
6. The festival provided local residents with opportunities to host family and friends from out of town.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
7. During the festival there were more visitors to the community.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
8. Locals took second place to visitors in their own community during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
9. Local residents enjoyed having visitors in the region during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
10. The festival leads to a disruption in the normal routines of local residents.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
11. Local residents avoided the attractions at the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
12. Residents were frustrated with an increased number of visitors during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
13. A diverse range of people from the local community attended the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5

SECTION B: IMPACT STATEMENTS CONTINUED...

				Very Large Negative Impact					Neutral Impact					Very Large Positive Impact	
14. There was a larger range of goods and services available for sale in the community during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
15. During the festival, the prices of goods and services in the community increased.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
16. During the festival there were increased job opportunities for locals.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
17. During the festival there was increased trade for local businesses.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
18. The festival provided opportunities for members of the community to develop new skills.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
19. Community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
20. The festival provided opportunities for local residents to display their musical talents.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
21. The festival provided fundraising opportunities for local community groups.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
22. During the festival, the footpaths and streets were crowded.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
23. There was difficulty finding car parking during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
24. During the festival there was increased traffic in the community.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
25. During the festival there was increased litter in the areas surrounding festival venues.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
26. There was crowding in local shops and facilities during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5

SECTION B: IMPACT STATEMENTS CONTINUED...

				Very Large Negative Impact					Neutral Impact					Very Large Positive Impact
27. During the festival, noise levels in the area surrounding the festival venues were increased.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
28. Road closures and redirections during the festival inconvenienced locals.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
29. There is a sense of community ownership of the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
30. Because of the festival, the pride of local residents in their town has increased.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
31. Community identity is enhanced through the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
32. The festival helps to show others why the community is unique and special.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
33. The festival gives the community an image which encourages tourism to the region.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
34. The festival contributed to a sense of togetherness within the community.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
35. The festival had a positive cultural impact on the community.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
36. Crime in the community increased during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
37. Vandalism in the community increased during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
38. There is increased rowdy and delinquent behaviour during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
39. Underage drinking occurred during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5

SECTION B: IMPACT STATEMENTS CONTINUED...

				Very Large Negative Impact						Neutral Impact				Very Large Positive Impact
40. The use of prohibited substances increased during the festival.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
41. The presence of police during the festival was adequate.	Y	N	DON'T KNOW	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5

If you would like to make any comments please do so in the space provided below. (Please print your response.)

SECTION C:

In order to group similar members of the community together, we need to ascertain your views on a range of factors as presented below.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements using the scale provided. For each statement, please circle the number that best reflects your opinion.

1 = strongly disagree	2 = disagree	3 = no opinion	4 = agree	5 = strongly agree

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. If I had to move away from Hadley I would be very sorry to leave.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I'd rather live in Hadley than anywhere else.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I think that the local community should be involved in the planning and management of festivals such as the Hadley Music Festival.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I think that I have an opportunity to be involved in the planning and management of the Hadley Music Festival.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I think that the positive social impacts of festivals such as the Hadley Music Festival should be spread throughout the community.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I think that the positive social impacts of the Hadley Music Festival are spread throughout the community.	1	2	3	4	5

7. 2004 was the 8th year of the Hadley Music Festival. How many of these years have you attended?

……

8. What did you do on the weekend of the 2004 Hadley Music Festival? (Please tick all that apply.)

☐ I was volunteering at the festival

☐ I attended the festival

☐ I didn't attend the festival

☐ I was working

☐ I left town for the weekend

☐ Other (please state) **……**

SECTION C CONTINUED…

9. During the weekend of the 2004 Hadley Music Festival, which of the following did you do? (Please tick all that apply.)

☐ Attended ticketed venues

☐ Attended the free street entertainment

10. Please tick the box next to the statement that most accurately reflects your level of interest in music and your support for the Hadley Music Festival. (Please tick only one box.)

☐ I am interested in music and am happy that the festival takes place in my community.

☐ I am interested in music but am not happy that the festival takes place in my community.

☐ I am not interested in music but am happy that the festival takes place in my community.

☐ I am not interested in music and am not happy that the festival takes place in my community.

11. Please tick the box next to the statement that most accurately reflects how you feel about the Hadley Music Festival. (Please tick only one box.)

☐ I love the Hadley Music Festival and hope it continues.

☐ I tolerate the Hadley Music Festival because overall I think it is good for the community.

☐ I have to adjust my lifestyle during the weekend of the Hadley Music Festival because of the inconveniences it causes me.

☐ I stay away from the area during the Hadley Music Festival because of the inconveniences it causes me, although overall I think it is good for the community.

☐ I dislike the Hadley Music Festival and would be happier if it didn't continue in future years.

Please answer each of the following questions by circling either Y (for YES) or N (for NO).

12. Did you volunteer your services on the weekend of the 2004 Hadley Music Festival? If you volunteered as part of a community group, please specify: ……..…	**Y**	**N**
13. Have you ever previously volunteered at the Hadley Music Festival?	**Y**	**N**
14. Are you currently involved in either paid or unpaid work in the tourism/hospitality industry?	**Y**	**N**
15. Have you ever previously worked (either paid or unpaid) in the tourism/hospitality industry?	**Y**	**N**
16. Do you have family or close friends who work (either paid or unpaid) in the tourism/hospitality industry?	**Y**	**N**
17. Did you undertake any paid work during the weekend of the 2004 Hadley Music Festival? If YES → Q18 If NO → Section D	**Y**	**N**
18. Do you think the volume of work in this business was increased as a result of the Hadley Music Festival?	**Y**	**N**

SECTION D: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In order to group your responses with other people similar to you, the following section asks for some background information. **All information will be kept strictly confidential and all responses will be aggregated so that no individual person can be identified.**

19. Are you:

☐ **Male** ☐ **Female**

20. In what year were you born?

……

21. In which country were you born?

……

22. How many years have you lived in Hadley? (to the nearest year)

……

23. How would you describe yourself?

☐ A full-time Hadley resident
☐ A part-time Hadley resident
☐ Other (please state)

……

24. Approximately how far do you live from where the Hadley Music Festival takes place?

☐ Within 500m
☐ Within I km
☐ Between 1km and 3kms
☐ More than 3kms

25. What is the highest level of education you have attained?

☐ No formal qualifications
☐ Year 10 or equivalent
☐ Year 12 or equivalent
☐ Undergraduate degree
☐ Postgraduate degree
☐ TAFE qualification or equivalent
☐ Trade qualification
☐ Other (please specify)

……

26. What is your employment status?

☐ Employed full-time
☐ Employed part-time
☐ Self-employed
☐ Unemployed
☐ Retired
☐ Student
☐ Home duties
☐ Other (please state)

……

27. What is/was your main occupation?

☐ Manager/administrator
☐ Professional
☐ Tradesperson or related
☐ Clerical worker
☐ Service worker
☐ Production worker
☐ Labourer or related
☐ Other (please specify)

……

28. What is your approximate annual <u>household</u> income?

☐ Prefer not to say
☐ Less than $20,000
☐ $20,000 - $39,999
☐ $40,000 - $59,999
☐ $60,000 - $79,999
☐ $80,000 - $99,999
☐ $100,000 - $119,999
☐ $120,000 - $139,999
☐ $140,000 - $159,999
☐ $160,000 - $179,999
☐ Over $180,000

SECTION E:

Please feel free to add any other comments that you would like to make about the Hadley Music Festival and its impacts on the local community. (Please print your response.)

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire. Please check that you have not accidentally missed any questions. Your time and effort are very much appreciated.

On completion, please return your questionnaire in the reply paid envelope provided. Remember, if returning more than one questionnaire please put each in a separate envelope. If the envelope has been misplaced, please forward to:

Katie Small
University of Western Sydney
School of Management
Campbelltown, Building 17, Level 2
Locked Bag 1797
Penrith South DC
NSW 1797

Appendix 3: Residents' Perceptions Questionnaire Cover Letter

17th December 2004

RESEARCH TITLE: Measuring Residents' Perceptions of the Social Impacts of The Hadley Music Festival

RESEARCHER: Katie Small, PhD Candidate in the School of Management, University of Western Sydney

Dear resident,

This is an invitation to take part in some important research being conducted on your community. I obtained your details from the local council, as it is members of the local community whose opinions I am particularly interested in. I'm a doctoral student at the University of Western Sydney and I'm conducting research on the social impacts of the Hadley Music Festival on local residents. Research into the impacts of community festivals is increasing, in large part due to a growing recognition of the positive and negative impacts they can have on the host communities in which they are taking place.

Your participation in this research will help build a picture of how your community is impacted by the hosting of the Hadley Music Festival. This research will provide festival organisers and stakeholders with an understanding of the issues that are of concern to the community. Such information may prove useful in future planning for the festival, allowing for the development of strategies to capitalise on positive impacts and minimise negative impacts as identified by the community.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to gather information on the social impacts that the hosting of the Hadley Music Festival has on the local community. I am interested in the opinions of all residents, regardless of whether you attended the festival or not. **Please find enclosed two copies of the questionnaire as well as two reply paid envelopes.** Two questionnaires have been provided to allow for more than one person within your household to respond, should this be applicable. **I would ask that only adult members of your household, persons aged 18 years or older, complete the questionnaires.** The questionnaire should take no longer than

15-30 minutes to complete. As there are a relatively small number of people living in Hadley, each individual response is very important to the accuracy of my research.

I would be grateful if you would agree to take part in this study by answering all questions and returning the completed questionnaire(s) in the stamped return envelope(s) provided. I would appreciate your response ***as soon as possible*** upon receipt of this letter, whilst your recollections of the festival weekend are still fresh in your mind, and prior to you taking any planned Christmas/New Year holidays. **Please return each questionnaire in a separate envelope.** If you would like extra copies of the questionnaire for additional household members please contact me on any of the numbers provided below.

Your participation is entirely voluntary and your anonymity is protected. Your name or other identifying information will not appear on any raw data or in any written report. Return of the questionnaire will be regarded as consent to use the information for research purposes.

I would be very happy to answer any questions you may have and can be contacted by telephone on 0418869226 or by email to k.small@uws.edu.au. Alternatively, you may contact one of my supervisors; Dr Gregory Teal on (02) 46203247 or Mrs Deborah Edwards on (02) 46203518.

Thank you for your valuable contribution to this research.

Katie Small
PhD Candidate

NOTE: This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC 04/102). If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Research Ethics Officers (tel: 02 4570 1136). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Appendix 4: Focus Groups Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

FOCUS GROUP

TITLE: Evaluating Residents' Perceptions of the Social Impacts of Community Festivals

INVESTIGATOR: Katie Small, PhD Candidate in the School of Management, University of Western Sydney

Dear Participant,

This is an invitation to take part in some important research being conducted on your community. Based on your involvement with the Hadley Music Festival, you have been randomly selected as a participant in this research by Genevieve Watson, Business Manager for the Hadley Music Festival. I am conducting a study to understand residents' perceptions of the social impacts that may result from the staging of a community festival. Festivals have been identified as one of the fastest growing forms of leisure and tourism activities, their appeal resting in the uniqueness and festive ambience they provide. Festivals can have a number of significant social impacts on a community, and I am keen to explore those impacts that the Hadley Music Festival may have on residents within Hadley.

The Hadley Music Festival is a participant in this research. The first stage of the study is to pilot the residents' perceptions questionnaire in a focus group, in order to identify any problems that may exist. A 'focus group' consists of four (4) to twelve (12) people of the same professional sub-group (focus). Your participation in this focus group is vital in providing meaningful comments for the refinement of the residents' perceptions questionnaire.

As a participant in the focus group, you will be asked to pre-test the residents' perceptions questionnaire, provide comments and opinions on content, and identify any ambiguities within the questionnaire. The questionnaire seeks opinions on a number of impact statements, providing insight into the perceived social impacts of the Hadley Music Festival.

The study is conducted to meet requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy (Management) under the supervision of Dr Gregory Teal and Mrs Deborah Edwards of the School of Management at the University of Western Sydney.

Your participation is entirely voluntary and your anonymity is protected by your name or other identifying information not appearing on any raw data or in any written report. The focus group will be taped for analysis purposes only.

I would be grateful if you would agree to take part in this study by signing the attached consent form. Signing this form will be regarded as consent to use the information for research purposes.

Focus Group Participation Consent Form

I (the participant) have had an opportunity to review the information sheet, and understand that my participation is voluntary and that I agree to participate in the focus group, knowing I can withdraw at any time. I understand that the focus group will be taped for analysis purposes only. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

Participant's name:

…… (print)

Participant's signature:

…… Date: ……

Investigator's name: Katie Small

Should you have any questions, or require clarification of any aspect regarding your involvement in the study, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone 0418869226 or email k.small@uws.edu.au. Alternatively, you may contact one of my supervisors; Greg Teal on (02) 46203247 or Deborah Edwards on (02) 46203518.

Thank you,

Katie Small

NOTE: This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC 04/102). If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Research Ethics Officers (tel: 02 4570 1136). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Appendix 5: Items Reworded for Inclusion in the Final Questionnaire

WORDING IN THE PRETEST	WORDING IN THE FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE
▪ The festival encourages too many visitors to my community.	▪ During the festival there were more visitors to the community.
▪ There is a greater police presence during the festival.	▪ The presence of police during the festival was adequate.
▪ Traffic was congested during the festival.	▪ During the festival there was increased traffic in the community.
▪ The festival brings the community together.	▪ The festival contributed to a sense of togetherness within the community.
▪ During the festival there will be increased opportunities for crimes in the community.	▪ Crime in the community increased during the festival.
▪ During the festival there will be increased drinking and/or rowdy behaviour.	▪ There is increased rowdy and delinquent behaviour during the festival.

Appendix 6: Items Deleted from the Final Questionnaire

ITEMS DELETED FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE
▪ Public transport services will be congested during the festival.
▪ The festival will contribute to increased business opportunities for locals following the festival.
▪ The festival will encourage an increase in the future use of existing recreational and leisure facilities by locals.
▪ The staging of this festival will encourage the restoration of existing public buildings.
▪ During the festival, public facilities (such as toilets, parks etc.) will be maintained at a high standard.
▪ The festival will encourage the local community to take an interest in the region's culture and history.
▪ Locals will be more aware of the cultural activities available in their community following the festival.
▪ Locals will be more likely to take part in future cultural activities of their community as a result of the festival.

Appendix 7: New Items Added into the Final Questionnaire

NEW ITEMS ADDED TO THE FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE
▪ The festival provided local residents with increased opportunities for cultural experiences.
▪ The festival provided local residents with opportunities to host family and friends from out of town.
▪ A diverse range of people from the local community attended the festival.
▪ The festival provided opportunities for local residents to display their musical talents.
▪ The festival provided fundraising opportunities for local community groups.
▪ During the festival, noise levels in the area surrounding the festival venues were increased.
▪ Road closures and redirections during the festival inconvenienced locals.
▪ There is a sense of community ownership of the festival.
▪ The festival helps to show others why the community is unique and special.
▪ The festival gives the community an image which encourages tourism to the region.
▪ Underage drinking occurred during the festival.
▪ The use of prohibited substances increased during the festival.
▪ Community groups worked together to achieve the goals of the festival.
▪ The festival provided opportunities for members of the community to develop new skills.
▪ Community identity is enhanced through the festival.

Appendix 8: Cluster Means on Each of the Social Impact Variables

	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	F STATISTIC df = 4
Inconvenience						
Increased traffic	-0.1	-1.4	-0.8	-2.5	0.0	8.297*
Difficulty finding parking	-0.3	-1.6	-0.9	-2.6	-0.2	7.530*
Increased noise levels	-0.8	-1.5	-0.4	-2.8	+0.1	10.529*
Crowding in local facilities	+0.2	-0.5	0.0	-1.8	+0.7	8.211*
Crowded streets	+0.9	0.0	+0.9	-1.9	+1.5	12.971*
Increased litter	-0.6	-2.2	-1.0	-2.4	-0.2	6.970*
Road closures	-0.9	-1.6	-0.6	-2.5	-0.4	9.279*
Community Identity and Cohesion						
Enhanced community identity	+3.0	+1.9	+2.9	-0.1	+3.3	21.415*
Increased pride in the town	+2.5	+1.6	+2.6	-1.4	+3.0	30.797*
Shows the community as unique	+2.7	+1.7	+2.8	-0.4	+3.2	22.765*
Community ownership of the festival	+2.5	+1.0	+2.5	-0.6	+2.8	16.048*
Positive cultural impact	+2.2	+1.5	+2.6	-1.6	+2.9	34.066*
Togetherness within the community	+2.2	+1.1	+2.7	-1.4	+3.0	33.440*
Enjoyed having visitors	+2.2	+1.2	+2.5	-1.7	+2.1	26.180*
An image to encourage tourism	+3.3	+2.5	+3.1	+0.2	+3.5	19.246*
Personal Frustration						
Frustration with visitors	-0.7	-0.9	-0.2	-2.1	-0.1	6.142*
Locals avoided the festival	0.0	-0.4	+0.3	-2.3	+0.4	11.103*
Locals take second place to visitors	0.0	-0.6	-0.1	-1.8	-0.2	4.668*
Disruption to normal routines	-0.8	-0.8	-0.1	-2.5	+0.4	12.385*
Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities						
More visitors to the community	+3.8	+2.9	+3.6	-0.2	+4.0	24.431*
Entertainment opportunities	+3.4	+3.0	+3.6	+1.0	+3.8	18.597*
Opportunities for social interaction	+2.7	+1.9	+3.4	+0.2	+3.3	27.502*
Meet new people	+2.2	+1.4	+2.5	-0.3	+2.6	18.944*
Shared family experiences	+2.6	+1.8	+3.0	-0.2	+2.9	18.464*
Cultural experiences	+2.5	+1.7	+3.0	-1.2	+2.9	38.288*
Diverse range of locals attended	+2.3	+1.9	+2.3	+0.2	+2.7	8.190*
Host family and friends	+3.0	+2.3	+3.2	+1.0	+3.4	11.188*
Community Growth and Development						
Develop new skills	+1.6	+1.1	+2.2	-1.2	+2.6	20.854*
Job opportunities	+2.1	+1.4	+2.1	-0.1	+2.6	9.037*
Fundraising opportunities	+2.5	+2.1	+3.0	+0.6	+3.6	11.745*

Display musical talents	+2.4	+2.0	+2.8	+0.3	+2.9	10.563*
Community groups work together	+3.1	+2.3	+3.3	+0.9	+3.5	14.719*
Behavioural Consequences						
Vandalism increased	-0.8	-2.0	-1.7	-2.8	-1.2	4.833*
Delinquent behaviour	-1.0	-1.9	-1.4	-2.6	-1.2	3.615*
Underage drinking	-1.3	-2.6	-1.9	-2.9	-1.7	*2.313*
Miscellaneous Impacts						
Increased trade	+3.6	+2.5	+3.5	+1.2	+3.6	12.461*
Larger range of goods and services	+1.9	+1.2	+1.9	-0.3	+2.3	9.672*
Increased price of goods and services	-0.1	-0.8	-0.4	-1.0	-0.2	*1.379*
Adequate police presence	+1.5	-0.1	+1.6	-0.6	+2.0	7.079*
Increased use of prohibited substances	-0.7	-2.2	-1.4	-2.8	-1.3	*1.983*
Increased crime	-0.7	-2.1	-1.0	-2.8	-0.9	6.480*

[a] Higher scores indicate large levels of impact (either positive or negative) for each impact statement.
[b] Scale range -5 to +5 for each impact statement.

* Differences are significant at the 5% level

Appendix 9: Post Hoc Tests – Inconvenience

A. Increased traffic

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.320	.087
	Attendees	.695	.488
	Avoiders	2.401*	.000
	Volunteers	-.072	1.000
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.320	.087
	Attendees	-.625	.743
	Avoiders	1.081	.299
	Volunteers	-1.392	.075
Attendees	Tolerators	-.695	.488
	Economically Connected	.625	.743
	Avoiders	1.706*	.003
	Volunteers	-.767	.430
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.401*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.081	.299
	Attendees	-1.706*	.003
	Volunteers	-2.473*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.072	1.000
	Economically Connected	1.392	.075
	Attendees	.767	.430
	Avoiders	2.473*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

B. Difficulty finding car parking

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.258	.149
	Attendees	.485	.811
	Avoiders	2.334*	.000
	Volunteers	-.112	.999
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.258	.149
	Attendees	-.774	.608
	Avoiders	1.075	.349
	Volunteers	-1.370	.107
Attendees	Tolerators	-.485	.811
	Economically Connected	.774	.608
	Avoiders	1.849*	.002
	Volunteers	-.597	.695
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.334*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.075	.349
	Attendees	-1.849*	.002
	Volunteers	-2.446*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.112	.999
	Economically Connected	1.370	.107
	Attendees	.597	.695
	Avoiders	2.446*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

C. Increased noise levels

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.647	.716
	Attendees	-.431	.847
	Avoiders	1.917*	.001
	Volunteers	-.971	.196
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.647	.716
	Attendees	-1.078	.192
	Avoiders	1.270	.125
	Volunteers	-1.618*	.016
Attendees	Tolerators	.431	.847
	Economically Connected	1.078	.192
	Avoiders	2.348*	.000
	Volunteers	-.539	.718
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.917*	.001
	Economically Connected	-1.270	.125
	Attendees	-2.348*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.888*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.971	.196
	Economically Connected	1.618*	.016
	Attendees	.539	.718
	Avoiders	2.888*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

D. Crowding in local facilities

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.689	.649
	Attendees	.167	.994
	Avoiders	2.010*	.000
	Volunteers	-.525	.762
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.689	.649
	Attendees	-.523	.826
	Avoiders	1.321	.088
	Volunteers	-1.214	.133
Attendees	Tolerators	-.167	.994
	Economically Connected	.523	.826
	Avoiders	1.844*	.000
	Volunteers	-.691	.493
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.010*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.321	.088
	Attendees	-1.844*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.535*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.525	.762
	Economically Connected	1.214	.133
	Attendees	.691	.493
	Avoiders	2.535*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

E. Crowded streets

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.808	.525
	Attendees	-.037	1.000
	Avoiders	2.695*	.000
	Volunteers	-.691	.554
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.808	.525
	Attendees	-.845	.456
	Avoiders	1.887*	.006
	Volunteers	-1.499*	.040
Attendees	Tolerators	.037	1.000
	Economically Connected	.845	.456
	Avoiders	2.732*	.000
	Volunteers	-.654	.581
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.695*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.887*	.006
	Attendees	-2.732*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.386*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.691	.554
	Economically Connected	1.499*	.040
	Attendees	.654	.581
	Avoiders	3.386*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

F. Increased litter

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.591*	.031
	Attendees	.452	.869
	Avoiders	1.812*	.004
	Volunteers	-.390	.930
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.591*	.031
	Attendees	-1.139	.164
	Avoiders	.221	.994
	Volunteers	-1.981*	.002
Attendees	Tolerators	-.452	.869
	Economically Connected	1.139	.164
	Avoiders	1.360*	.033
	Volunteers	-.842	.319
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.812*	.004
	Economically Connected	-.221	.994
	Attendees	-1.360*	.033
	Volunteers	-2.201*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.390	.930
	Economically Connected	1.981*	.002
	Attendees	.842	.319
	Avoiders	2.201*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

G. Road closures

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.693	.432
	Attendees	-.301	.901
	Avoiders	1.517*	.000
	Volunteers	-.529	.577
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.693	.432
	Attendees	-.994	.095
	Avoiders	.824	.291
	Volunteers	-1.222*	.029
Attendees	Tolerators	.301	.901
	Economically Connected	.994	.095
	Avoiders	1.818*	.000
	Volunteers	-.228	.966
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.517*	.000
	Economically Connected	-.824	.291
	Attendees	-1.818*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.046*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.529	.577
	Economically Connected	1.222*	.029
	Attendees	.228	.966
	Avoiders	2.046*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

Appendix 10: Post Hoc Tests - Community Identity and Cohesion

A. Enhanced community identity

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.065	.069
	Attendees	.113	.997
	Avoiders	3.131*	.000
	Volunteers	-.329	.877
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.065	.069
	Attendees	-.952	.117
	Avoiders	2.066*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.394*	.008
Attendees	Tolerators	-.113	.997
	Economically Connected	.952	.117
	Avoiders	3.018*	.000
	Volunteers	-.442	.676
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.131*	.000
	Economically Connected	-2.066*	.000
	Attendees	-3.018*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.460*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.329	.877
	Economically Connected	1.394*	.008
	Attendees	.442	.676
	Avoiders	3.460*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

B. Increased pride in the town

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.877	.335
	Attendees	-.156	.995
	Avoiders	3.921*	.000
	Volunteers	-.537	.665
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.877	.335
	Attendees	-1.033	.153
	Avoiders	3.044*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.414*	.020
Attendees	Tolerators	.156	.995
	Economically Connected	1.033	.153
	Avoiders	4.077*	.000
	Volunteers	-.381	.855
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.921*	.000
	Economically Connected	-3.044*	.000
	Attendees	-4.077*	.000
	Volunteers	-4.459*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.537	.665
	Economically Connected	1.414*	.020
	Attendees	.381	.855
	Avoiders	4.459*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

C. Shows the community as unique

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.059	.076
	Attendees	-.098	.998
	Avoiders	3.125*	.000
	Volunteers	-.508	.610
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.059	.076
	Attendees	-1.157*	.035
	Avoiders	2.067*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.567*	.002
Attendees	Tolerators	.098	.998
	Economically Connected	1.157*	.035
	Avoiders	3.224*	.000
	Volunteers	-.410	.762
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.125*	.000
	Economically Connected	-2.067*	.000
	Attendees	-3.224*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.634*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.508	.610
	Economically Connected	1.567*	.002
	Attendees	.410	.762
	Avoiders	3.634*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

D. Community ownership of the festival

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.500*	.014
	Attendees	.042	1.000
	Avoiders	3.127*	.000
	Volunteers	-.338	.928
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.500*	.014
	Attendees	-1.458*	.013
	Avoiders	1.627*	.015
	Volunteers	-1.838*	.001
Attendees	Tolerators	-.042	1.000
	Economically Connected	1.458*	.013
	Avoiders	3.086*	.000
	Volunteers	-.380	.876
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.127*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.627*	.015
	Attendees	-3.086*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.465*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.338	.928
	Economically Connected	1.838*	.001
	Attendees	.380	.876
	Avoiders	3.465*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

E. Positive cultural impact

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.637	.560
	Attendees	-.440	.718
	Avoiders	3.744*	.000
	Volunteers	-.737	.278
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.637	.560
	Attendees	-1.078	.060
	Avoiders	3.107*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.374*	.011
Attendees	Tolerators	.440	.718
	Economically Connected	1.078	.060
	Avoiders	4.185*	.000
	Volunteers	-.297	.915
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.744*	.000
	Economically Connected	-3.107*	.000
	Attendees	-4.185*	.000
	Volunteers	-4.481*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.737	.278
	Economically Connected	1.374*	.011
	Attendees	.297	.915
	Avoiders	4.481*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

F. Togetherness within the community

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.090	.090
	Attendees	-.459	.709
	Avoiders	3.640*	.000
	Volunteers	-.721	.296
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.090	.090
	Attendees	-1.550*	.003
	Avoiders	2.550*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.812*	.000
Attendees	Tolerators	.459	.709
	Economically Connected	1.550*	.003
	Avoiders	4.100*	.000
	Volunteers	-.262	.949
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.640*	.000
	Economically Connected	-2.550*	.000
	Attendees	-4.100*	.000
	Volunteers	-4.362*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.721	.296
	Economically Connected	1.812*	.000
	Attendees	.262	.949
	Avoiders	4.362*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

G. Enjoyed having visitors

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.058	.152
	Attendees	-.222	.977
	Avoiders	3.944*	.000
	Volunteers	.113	.999
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.058	.152
	Attendees	-1.281*	.035
	Avoiders	2.886*	.000
	Volunteers	-.945	.259
Attendees	Tolerators	.222	.977
	Economically Connected	1.281*	.035
	Avoiders	4.166*	.000
	Volunteers	.336	.907
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.944*	.000
	Economically Connected	-2.886*	.000
	Attendees	-4.166*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.830*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	-.113	.999
	Economically Connected	.945	.259
	Attendees	-.336	.907
	Avoiders	3.830*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

H. An image to encourage tourism

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.781	.280
	Attendees	.206	.966
	Avoiders	3.124*	.000
	Volunteers	-.192	.980
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.781	.280
	Attendees	-.575	.580
	Avoiders	2.342*	.000
	Volunteers	-.973	.124
Attendees	Tolerators	-.206	.966
	Economically Connected	.575	.580
	Avoiders	2.918*	.000
	Volunteers	-.398	.757
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.124*	.000
	Economically Connected	-2.342*	.000
	Attendees	-2.918*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.315*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.192	.980
	Economically Connected	.973	.124
	Attendees	.398	.757
	Avoiders	3.315*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

Appendix 11: Post Hoc Tests - Personal Frustration

A. Frustration with visitors

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.192	.995
	Attendees	-.425	.835
	Avoiders	1.442*	.013
	Volunteers	-.568	.697
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.192	.995
	Attendees	-.618	.675
	Avoiders	1.250	.097
	Volunteers	-.760	.537
Attendees	Tolerators	.425	.835
	Economically Connected	.618	.675
	Avoiders	1.867*	.000
	Volunteers	-.142	.997
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.442*	.013
	Economically Connected	-1.250	.097
	Attendees	-1.867*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.010*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.568	.697
	Economically Connected	.760	.537
	Attendees	.142	.997
	Avoiders	2.010*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

B. Locals avoided the festival

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.351	.962
	Attendees	-.321	.944
	Avoiders	2.321*	.000
	Volunteers	-.391	.909
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.351	.962
	Attendees	-.672	.651
	Avoiders	1.970*	.002
	Volunteers	-.742	.598
Attendees	Tolerators	.321	.944
	Economically Connected	.672	.651
	Avoiders	2.642*	.000
	Volunteers	-.070	1.000
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.321*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.970*	.002
	Attendees	-2.642*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.712*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.391	.909
	Economically Connected	.742	.598
	Attendees	.070	1.000
	Avoiders	2.712*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

C. Locals take second place to visitors

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.638	.703
	Attendees	.143	.997
	Avoiders	1.788*	.001
	Volunteers	.261	.975
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.638	.703
	Attendees	-.496	.841
	Avoiders	1.150	.175
	Volunteers	-.378	.945
Attendees	Tolerators	-.143	.997
	Economically Connected	.496	.841
	Avoiders	1.646*	.001
	Volunteers	.118	.999
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.788*	.001
	Economically Connected	-1.150	.175
	Attendees	-1.646*	.001
	Volunteers	-1.528*	.008
Volunteers	Tolerators	-.261	.975
	Economically Connected	.378	.945
	Attendees	-.118	.999
	Avoiders	1.528*	.008

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

D. Disruption to normal routines

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.019	1.000
	Attendees	-.745	.260
	Avoiders	1.636*	.001
	Volunteers	-1.250*	.016
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.019	1.000
	Attendees	-.764	.432
	Avoiders	1.617*	.008
	Volunteers	-1.269	.059
Attendees	Tolerators	.745	.260
	Economically Connected	.764	.432
	Avoiders	2.381*	.000
	Volunteers	-.505	.698
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.636*	.001
	Economically Connected	-1.617*	.008
	Attendees	-2.381*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.886*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	1.250*	.016
	Economically Connected	1.269	.059
	Attendees	.505	.698
	Avoiders	2.886*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

Appendix 12: Post Hoc Tests - Entertainment and Socialisation Opportunities

A. More visitors to the community

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.865	.349
	Attendees	.192	.987
	Avoiders	4.001*	.000
	Volunteers	-.102	.999
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.865	.349
	Attendees	-.673	.598
	Avoiders	3.135*	.000
	Volunteers	-.967	.280
Attendees	Tolerators	-.192	.987
	Economically Connected	.673	.598
	Avoiders	3.808*	.000
	Volunteers	-.294	.950
Avoiders	Tolerators	-4.001*	.000
	Economically Connected	-3.135*	.000
	Attendees	-3.808*	.000
	Volunteers	-4.102*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.102	.999
	Economically Connected	.967	.280
	Attendees	.294	.950
	Avoiders	4.102*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

B. Entertainment opportunities

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.435	.725
	Attendees	-.181	.971
	Avoiders	2.448*	.000
	Volunteers	-.408	.684
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.435	.725
	Attendees	-.617	.377
	Avoiders	2.013*	.000
	Volunteers	-.844	.138
Attendees	Tolerators	.181	.971
	Economically Connected	.617	.377
	Avoiders	2.630*	.000
	Volunteers	-.227	.945
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.448*	.000
	Economically Connected	-2.013*	.000
	Attendees	-2.630*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.857*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.408	.684
	Economically Connected	.844	.138
	Attendees	.227	.945
	Avoiders	2.857*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

C. Opportunities for social interaction

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.779	.134
	Attendees	-.674	.096
	Avoiders	2.555*	.000
	Volunteers	-.627	.199
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.779	.134
	Attendees	-1.453*	.000
	Avoiders	1.776*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.406*	.000
Attendees	Tolerators	.674	.096
	Economically Connected	1.453*	.000
	Avoiders	3.229*	.000
	Volunteers	.047	1.000
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.555*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.776*	.000
	Attendees	-3.229*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.182*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.627	.199
	Economically Connected	1.406*	.000
	Attendees	-.047	1.000
	Avoiders	3.182*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

D. Meet new people

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.885	.100
	Attendees	-.298	.860
	Avoiders	2.570*	.000
	Volunteers	-.356	.797
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.885	.100
	Attendees	-1.183*	.008
	Avoiders	1.685*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.241*	.007
Attendees	Tolerators	.298	.860
	Economically Connected	1.183*	.008
	Avoiders	2.868*	.000
	Volunteers	-.058	1.000
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.570*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.685*	.000
	Attendees	-2.868*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.926*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.356	.797
	Economically Connected	1.241*	.007
	Attendees	.058	1.000
	Avoiders	2.926*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

E. Shared family experiences

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.785	.217
	Attendees	-.457	.557
	Avoiders	2.769*	.000
	Volunteers	-.342	.831
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.785	.217
	Attendees	-1.243*	.006
	Avoiders	1.983*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.127*	.026
Attendees	Tolerators	.457	.557
	Economically Connected	1.243*	.006
	Avoiders	3.226*	.000
	Volunteers	.115	.996
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.769*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.983*	.000
	Attendees	-3.226*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.111*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.342	.831
	Economically Connected	1.127*	.026
	Attendees	-.115	.996
	Avoiders	3.111*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

F. Cultural experiences

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.858	.102
	Attendees	-.500	.400
	Avoiders	3.687*	.000
	Volunteers	-.400	.679
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.858	.102
	Attendees	-1.358*	.001
	Avoiders	2.828*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.258*	.004
Attendees	Tolerators	.500	.400
	Economically Connected	1.358*	.001
	Avoiders	4.187*	.000
	Volunteers	.100	.997
Avoiders	Tolerators	-3.687*	.000
	Economically Connected	-2.828*	.000
	Attendees	-4.187*	.000
	Volunteers	-4.086*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.400	.679
	Economically Connected	1.258*	.004
	Attendees	-.100	.997
	Avoiders	4.086*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

G. Diverse range of locals attended

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.467	.831
	Attendees	.013	1.000
	Avoiders	2.137*	.000
	Volunteers	-.355	.887
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.467	.831
	Attendees	-.454	.790
	Avoiders	1.669*	.005
	Volunteers	-.822	.279
Attendees	Tolerators	-.013	1.000
	Economically Connected	.454	.790
	Avoiders	2.123*	.000
	Volunteers	-.368	.806
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.137*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.669*	.005
	Attendees	-2.123*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.491*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.355	.887
	Economically Connected	.822	.279
	Attendees	.368	.806
	Avoiders	2.491*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

H. Host family and friends

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.686	.370
	Attendees	-.236	.940
	Avoiders	1.983*	.000
	Volunteers	-.477	.605
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.686	.370
	Attendees	-.923	.098
	Avoiders	1.296*	.020
	Volunteers	-1.163*	.026
Attendees	Tolerators	.236	.940
	Economically Connected	.923	.098
	Avoiders	2.219*	.000
	Volunteers	-.240	.947
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.983*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.296*	.020
	Attendees	-2.219*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.459*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.477	.605
	Economically Connected	1.163*	.026
	Attendees	.240	.947
	Avoiders	2.459*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

Appendix 13: Post Hoc Tests - Community Growth and Development

A. Develop new skills

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.525	.712
	Attendees	-.548	.530
	Avoiders	2.828*	.000
	Volunteers	-.960	.058
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.525	.712
	Attendees	-1.073	.057
	Avoiders	2.303*	.000
	Volunteers	-1.486*	.002
Attendees	Tolerators	.548	.530
	Economically Connected	1.073	.057
	Avoiders	3.376*	.000
	Volunteers	-.412	.740
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.828*	.000
	Economically Connected	-2.303*	.000
	Attendees	-3.376*	.000
	Volunteers	-3.788*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.960	.058
	Economically Connected	1.486*	.002
	Attendees	.412	.740
	Avoiders	3.788*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

B. Job opportunities

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.757	.503
	Attendees	.058	1.000
	Avoiders	2.167*	.000
	Volunteers	-.521	.729
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.757	.503
	Attendees	-.699	.540
	Avoiders	1.410*	.045
	Volunteers	-1.278	.057
Attendees	Tolerators	-.058	1.000
	Economically Connected	.699	.540
	Avoiders	2.109*	.000
	Volunteers	-.579	.591
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.167*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.410*	.045
	Attendees	-2.109*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.688*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.521	.729
	Economically Connected	1.278	.057
	Attendees	.579	.591
	Avoiders	2.688*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

C. Fundraising opportunities

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.469	.883
	Attendees	-.447	.829
	Avoiders	1.880*	.001
	Volunteers	-1.102	.080
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.469	.883
	Attendees	-.916	.299
	Avoiders	1.411*	.047
	Volunteers	-1.571*	.010
Attendees	Tolerators	.447	.829
	Economically Connected	.916	.299
	Avoiders	2.327*	.000
	Volunteers	-.655	.465
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.880*	.001
	Economically Connected	-1.411*	.047
	Attendees	-2.327*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.982*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	1.102	.080
	Economically Connected	1.571*	.010
	Attendees	.655	.465
	Avoiders	2.982*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

D. Display musical talents

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.319	.953
	Attendees	-.389	.842
	Avoiders	2.092*	.000
	Volunteers	-.524	.662
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.319	.953
	Attendees	-.707	.469
	Avoiders	1.773*	.002
	Volunteers	-.842	.310
Attendees	Tolerators	.389	.842
	Economically Connected	.707	.469
	Avoiders	2.481*	.000
	Volunteers	-.135	.996
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.092*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.773*	.002
	Attendees	-2.481*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.615*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.524	.662
	Economically Connected	.842	.310
	Attendees	.135	.996
	Avoiders	2.615*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

E. Community groups work together

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.814	.152
	Attendees	-.197	.965
	Avoiders	2.228*	.000
	Volunteers	-.452	.608
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.814	.152
	Attendees	-1.011*	.030
	Avoiders	1.414*	.003
	Volunteers	-1.266*	.005
Attendees	Tolerators	.197	.965
	Economically Connected	1.011*	.030
	Avoiders	2.425*	.000
	Volunteers	-.255	.918
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.228*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.414*	.003
	Attendees	-2.425*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.680*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.452	.608
	Economically Connected	1.266*	.005
	Attendees	.255	.918
	Avoiders	2.680*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

Appendix 14: Post Hoc Tests - Behavioural Consequences

A. Vandalism increased

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.276	.150
	Attendees	.917	.366
	Avoiders	2.022*	.001
	Volunteers	.495	.878
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.276	.150
	Attendees	-.360	.960
	Avoiders	.746	.617
	Volunteers	-.781	.603
Attendees	Tolerators	-.917	.366
	Economically Connected	.360	.960
	Avoiders	1.105	.133
	Volunteers	-.422	.911
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.022*	.001
	Economically Connected	-.746	.617
	Attendees	-1.105	.133
	Volunteers	-1.527*	.017
Volunteers	Tolerators	-.495	.878
	Economically Connected	.781	.603
	Attendees	.422	.911
	Avoiders	1.527*	.017

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

B. Delinquent behaviour

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.970	.312
	Attendees	.426	.861
	Avoiders	1.580*	.008
	Volunteers	.199	.993
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.970	.312
	Attendees	-.544	.770
	Avoiders	.609	.743
	Volunteers	-.771	.533
Attendees	Tolerators	-.426	.861
	Economically Connected	.544	.770
	Avoiders	1.153	.055
	Volunteers	-.227	.983
Avoiders	Tolerators	-1.580*	.008
	Economically Connected	-.609	.743
	Attendees	-1.153	.055
	Volunteers	-1.380*	.025
Volunteers	Tolerators	-.199	.993
	Economically Connected	.771	.533
	Attendees	.227	.983
	Avoiders	1.380*	.025

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

Appendix 15: Post Hoc Tests - Miscellaneous Impacts

A. Increased trade

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.045	.065
	Attendees	.101	.998
	Avoiders	2.424*	.000
	Volunteers	-.020	1.000
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.045	.065
	Attendees	-.945	.118
	Avoiders	1.379*	.013
	Volunteers	-1.065	.075
Attendees	Tolerators	-.101	.998
	Economically Connected	.945	.118
	Avoiders	2.323*	.000
	Volunteers	-.121	.997
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.424*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.379*	.013
	Attendees	-2.323*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.444*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.020	1.000
	Economically Connected	1.065	.075
	Attendees	.121	.997
	Avoiders	2.444*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

B. Larger range of goods and services

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	.654	.554
	Attendees	-.064	1.000
	Avoiders	2.203*	.000
	Volunteers	-.397	.836
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-.654	.554
	Attendees	-.718	.419
	Avoiders	1.549*	.011
	Volunteers	-1.051	.113
Attendees	Tolerators	.064	1.000
	Economically Connected	.718	.419
	Avoiders	2.267*	.000
	Volunteers	-.333	.890
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.203*	.000
	Economically Connected	-1.549*	.011
	Attendees	-2.267*	.000
	Volunteers	-2.600*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.397	.836
	Economically Connected	1.051	.113
	Attendees	.333	.890
	Avoiders	2.600*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

C. Adequate police presence

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.632	.073
	Attendees	-.085	1.000
	Avoiders	2.063*	.005
	Volunteers	-.514	.870
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.632	.073
	Attendees	-1.717*	.032
	Avoiders	.431	.965
	Volunteers	-2.146*	.004
Attendees	Tolerators	.085	1.000
	Economically Connected	1.717*	.032
	Avoiders	2.148*	.001
	Volunteers	-.429	.904
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.063*	.005
	Economically Connected	-.431	.965
	Attendees	-2.148*	.001
	Volunteers	-2.577*	.000
Volunteers	Tolerators	.514	.870
	Economically Connected	2.146*	.004
	Attendees	.429	.904
	Avoiders	2.577*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level

D. Increased crime

(I) CLUSTERS	(J) CLUSTERS	MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)	SIG.
Tolerators	Economically Connected	1.435	.134
	Attendees	.323	.978
	Avoiders	2.164*	.001
	Volunteers	.253	.992
Economically Connected	Tolerators	-1.435	.134
	Attendees	-1.111	.267
	Avoiders	.729	.679
	Volunteers	-1.182	.231
Attendees	Tolerators	-.323	.978
	Economically Connected	1.111	.267
	Avoiders	1.840*	.002
	Volunteers	-.071	1.000
Avoiders	Tolerators	-2.164*	.001
	Economically Connected	-.729	.679
	Attendees	-1.840*	.002
	Volunteers	-1.911*	.002
Volunteers	Tolerators	-.253	.992
	Economically Connected	1.182	.231
	Attendees	.071	1.000
	Avoiders	1.911*	.002

* The mean difference is significant at the 5% level