

## FESTIVAL QUALITY, VALUE, AND SPORTS ENVIRONMENT AFFECTING STUDENTS' SATISFACTION AND LOYALTY: BASIS FOR CONTINUOUS EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITY OFFERING

### QUALIDADE, VALOR E AMBIENTE ESPORTIVO DO FESTIVAL AFETAM A SATISFAÇÃO E A FIDELIDADE DOS ALUNOS: BASE PARA OFERTA CONTINUADA DE ATIVIDADES EXTRACURRICULARES

Joseph Lobo<sup>1</sup> and Diana Varona<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bulacan State University, City of Malolos-Bulacan, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Systems Plus College Foundation, Angeles-Pampanga, Philippines

#### RESUMO

Eventos extracurriculares como o festival desportivo, onde os alunos podem demonstrar as suas competências desportivas e recreativas organizadas, são essenciais no ensino superior. Os alunos também podem desenvolver liderança, camaradagem e espírito desportivo enquanto competem em cada jogo. Os festivais desportivos incentivam os alunos a serem ativos e saudáveis por meio de jogos. Este estudo examinou as percepções dos alunos sobre qualidade, valor e ambiente desportivo, o que afeta sua satisfação e lealdade às atividades extracurriculares. Mais importante ainda, o estudo ajudará o departamento e a administração a decidir se os festivais desportivos podem ser realizados regularmente para melhorar a cultura física do campus. Os entrevistados deste estudo são alunos de uma faculdade local que participaram do recente Festival Desportivo realizado pelos alunos e pelo departamento. A Pesquisa de Satisfação do Festival (FSS) foi modificada para atender ao estudo atual, eliminando o aspecto do souvenir. Além disso, o Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire (YSEQ) foi utilizado para incluir os dois componentes da primeira medida como construções extras. Uma ANOVA/Kruskal-Wallis H unidirecional foi realizada para investigar diferenças de FS e FL com base na demografia. A análise de Spearman Rho descreveu relações variáveis. Por fim, utilizou-se regressão múltipla para avaliar se o QVSE influencia a satisfação e a lealdade. Com base nos resultados, a satisfação e a lealdade do festival não diferiram entre os grupos (excluindo o grupo do ano). Além disso, o QVSE tem uma relação significativa com FS e FL. Por último, o QVSE tem influência direta sobre FS e FL. Para proporcionar aos alunos uma experiência significativa e desenvolver e preservar a cultura física do campus, o departamento e a administração podem oferecer regularmente atividades como o festival desportivo.

**Palavras-chave:** Lealdade ao festival, Satisfação com o festival, Qualidade do festival, Valor do festival, Ambiente desportivo, Evento desportivo

#### ABSTRACT

Extracurricular events like the sports festival, where students can demonstrate their skills in organized sports and recreation, are essential in higher education. Students can also develop leadership, camaraderie, and sportsmanship while competing in each game. Sports festivals encourage students to be active and healthy through games. This study examined students' perceptions of quality, value, and sports environment, which affects their satisfaction and loyalty to extracurricular activities. Most importantly, the study will help the department and administration decide if sports festivals can be held regularly to enhance campus physical culture. The respondents for this study are students from a local college who participated in the recent Sports Festival conducted by the students and department. The Festival Satisfaction Survey (FSS) was modified to meet the current study by eliminating the souvenir aspect. Additionally, the Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire (YSEQ) was employed to include the two components in the former measure as extra constructs. A one-way ANOVA/Kruskal-Wallis H was performed to investigate FS and FL differences based on demographics. Spearman Rho's analysis described variable relationships. Finally, multiple regression was used to assess if QVSE influence satisfaction and loyalty. Based on the findings, festival satisfaction and loyalty did not differ between groups (excluding year level group). Also, QVSE has a significant relationship with FS and FL. Lastly, QVSE has a direct influence on FS and FL. To give students a meaningful experience and develop and preserve campus physical culture, the department and administration may regularly offer activities like the sports festival.

**Keywords:** Festival loyalty, Festival satisfaction, Festival quality, Festival value, Sports environment, Sports event

#### Introduction

The global number of cultural celebrations has skyrocketed during the past few years<sup>1</sup>. Festivals have quickly become a significant and increasingly popular part of the tourism business as attendance has increased in tandem with production<sup>2</sup>. Aside from the tourism industry, as an

added bonus, many schools and universities use their revenues to fund extracurricular activities, such as sports competitions for college students. It is well known that college students devote a considerable amount of their time to classroom activities, where they are subjected to an extensive spectrum of academic demands and social expectations<sup>3</sup>. In this regard, one way to alleviate stress and to develop social connection with peers is through various sports activities<sup>4</sup>, such as Sports Festival. It has been known across various scholarly works that engaging to sport activities may improve mental health, which includes better psychological well-being (e.g., higher self-esteem and life satisfaction), and lower psychological ill-being (e.g., reduced levels of depression, anxiety and stress)<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, sport participation provides a platform for college students to develop healthy relationship with their peers demonstrating positive leadership, strategic and goal thinking, camaraderie and sportsmanship<sup>6</sup>. In conclusion, provision of physical activities to college students, such as Sports Festival, is highly important as other academic courses being provided to students to foster physical culture and develop their overall well-being.

### *Festival quality and value*

In this particular study, the definition of festival quality will be based on how it is defined in the tourism industry. As such, the concept of *festival quality* has been defined as the global judgment or attitude relating to the superiority of the service<sup>7</sup>. Rather than relying on gaps between expected and perceived service quality, for instance, festival quality is used as a predictor of satisfaction and behavioral intentions<sup>8</sup>. The assumption is, many festival-goers base their decision to attend on the expectation that the event will maintain its high standard of quality. According to Baker and Crompton<sup>9</sup>, the quality of a festival may be broken down into four categories: the generic features (festival characteristics), the specialized entertainment features, the information sources (such as printed programs and information booths), and the comfort facilities for festival attendees. It has been determined, on the basis of the aforementioned analysis, that the quality of the festival consists of multiple dimensions<sup>10</sup>. Meanwhile, *festival value* is defined as when the festivalgoers determine the value of the event by mentally making a comparison between the benefits they obtain and the sacrifices they make in terms of time, money, and effort<sup>11</sup>. Festival value is positively evaluated when attendees perceive greater "get" from the festival's various dimensions, such as educational service, program, souvenirs, food, and amenities (convenient parking lot, rest place, and clean restroom)<sup>12</sup>. Value's function in festivals has been the subject of some empirical research. Perceived value influences festival enjoyment and loyalty, according to studies of a variety of festivals<sup>13</sup>.

### *Sports Environment*

The conditions in which a sportsperson participates in a sporting event are referred to as the sports environment<sup>14</sup>. However, in this study, it is mainly focused on the conceptualization of team cohesion. As stated by Eys et al.<sup>15</sup> in their scholarly paper in which it is focused on the development of the Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire, when it comes to the success of small groups, cohesion is a key factor. For instance, consider its significance in the realm of sports. On a sports team, cohesion can serve a variety of purposes, which determines whether the team will be successful or unsuccessful throughout the course of a game or a season<sup>16</sup>. Cohesiveness in a sports team is the result of a series of dynamic processes in which members attract and cooperate with one another to achieve team goals or maintain team structure. Cohesion within a team is what keeps people from quitting and what helps them succeed together<sup>17</sup>. Additionally, it refers to the degree to which a team is able to work together to achieve its goals and satisfy the emotional needs of its members. It is important to understand the indicators that individuals use to form impressions of cohesion, but this definition focuses on the meaning of the concept<sup>18</sup>.

### *Festival Satisfaction and Loyalty*

Previous studies on festival-goers' have focused on the purchases they make and the reasons they follow particular events which determines their level of *festival satisfaction*<sup>19</sup>. Other scholars have defined festival satisfaction as an emotional reaction impacted by the qualities that festivalgoers encounter<sup>20</sup>. In contrast to a disconfirmation framework based on cognitive processes, the quality of the visitor's experience is the emotional and psychological result of their interactions with the service provider<sup>21</sup>. Many studies in the fields of tourism and festivals have adopted and empirically tested these two types of attitudes with cognitive and affective components for the conceptualization of quality and satisfaction<sup>22,23</sup>. Festival quality has been used as a precursor to festival satisfaction<sup>24</sup>, and this can be thought of as a sequential, discrete evaluation process involved in the formation of post-consumption attitudes. Meanwhile, in the literature on marketing and tourism, the ideas of behavioral intentions and *loyalty* are synonymous<sup>25</sup>. Additionally, it was determined that the quality of the experience can be improved by boosting the attention and participation of festival attendees, which will ultimately lead to a perceived feeling of value and satisfaction, which would, in turn, contribute to visitor loyalty<sup>26</sup>. Hence, *festival loyalty* can be defined as the festivalgoers' commitment on returning and participating again in a festival because of the quality and satisfaction they have experienced<sup>27</sup>.

#### *Aims and Hypotheses Formulation*

This current investigation has several aims. First, this study is focused on observing the significant difference in terms of students' festival satisfaction and loyalty with respect to gender, age, and year level. Lastly, this study has combined the factors under Festival Quality and Value such as Informational Service (IS), Program (PG), Food (FD), Facility (FT) and Festival Value (FV), and Sports Environment's construct such as the Tasks (TS) and Social (SC) factors as a variable, and determining if these has a direct relationship with Festival Satisfaction (FS) and Festival Loyalty (FL). After performing numerous attempts in searching for related studies that were conducted in relation to determining the relationship between Festival Quality, Value, and Sport Environment (QVSE) to Festival Satisfaction and Loyalty in terms of Sports Festival being offered to college students, no investigations were not yet conducted. Moreover, this study is aimed to determine if sports festival may still be continued to be offered to college students in providing opportunities for enjoyment and improvement of overall well-being. In this regard, this study will test the following hypotheses:

- H<sub>1</sub>:** Quality, Value, and Sport Environment has no significant relationship with Festival Satisfaction;
- H<sub>2</sub>:** IS has a significant relationship with FS;
- H<sub>3</sub>:** PG has a significant relationship with FS;
- H<sub>4</sub>:** FD has a significant relationship with FS;
- H<sub>5</sub>:** FT has a significant relationship with FS;
- H<sub>6</sub>:** FV has a significant relationship with FS;
- H<sub>7</sub>:** TS has no significant relationship with FS;
- H<sub>8</sub>:** SC have no significant relationship with FS;
- H<sub>9</sub>:** Quality, Value, and Sport Environment has no significant relationship with FL;
- H<sub>10</sub>:** IS has a significant relationship with FL;
- H<sub>11</sub>:** PG has a significant relationship with FL;
- H<sub>12</sub>:** FD has a significant relationship with FL;
- H<sub>13</sub>:** FT has a significant relationship with FL;
- H<sub>14</sub>:** FV has a significant relationship with FL;
- H<sub>15</sub>:** TS has no significant relationship with FL;
- H<sub>16</sub>:** SC have no significant relationship with FL;

## Methods

### *Participants and Sampling technique*

In this study, the respondents for the study are undergraduate students under a Teacher Education Program specializing in Physical Education enrolled during the 1<sup>st</sup> Semester, Academic Year 2022-2023, at City College of Angeles, Philippines. The method that was used to recruit respondents for the study is *Purposeful sampling technique*. It is a non-probability sampling technique in which the researchers deliberately pick the respondents for the study due to their characteristics that are highly fitted for the investigation. In this regard, the study has formulated a selection criterion in order to maximize the reliability of the data obtained:

1. A student currently pursuing a Bachelor of Physical Education at City College of Angeles, Philippines;
2. Currently first- to third-year college;
3. Regular or irregular students;
4. From various spectrums of gender identity; and
5. Have joined the recently organized sports festival Magbaláue 2022: “Reset and Rebuild: Accelerate, Close the Gap.”

Tables 1 illustrates demographic characteristics of the respondents. Figure 1 displays the respondents' gender which most of them are female [ $N_{\text{Female}} = 165(53.9\%)$ ], followed by male [ $N_{\text{Male}} = 109(35.6\%)$ ] and those from the LGBTQIAP+ [ $N_{\text{LGBTQIAP+}} = 32(10.5\%)$ ]. Meanwhile, Figure 2 showcases the respondents' age groups positing that most of them are under the 19-22 age bracket [ $N_{19-22\text{yo}} = 350(81.7\%)$ ], followed by those 23-25 [ $N_{23-25\text{yo}} = 46(15.0\%)$ ] and 26 years old and above [ $N_{26\text{yo and above}} = 10(3.3\%)$ ]. Lastly, Figure 3 exhibited respondents' year level postulating that most of them are second-year students [ $N_{\text{second year}} = 141(46.1\%)$ ], followed by those from the first year [ $N_{\text{first year}} = 105(34.3\%)$ ] and third-year [ $N_{\text{third year}} = 60(19.6\%)$ ]. In general, there are 306 respondents who have voluntarily participated in the study.

**Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Variables	Items	N(%)
Gender	Male	109(35.6%)
	Female	165(53.9%)
	LGBTQIAP+	32(10.5%)
Age Group	19-22 years old	350(81.7%)
	23-25 years old	46(15.0%)
	26 years old and above	10(3.3%)
Year Level	1 <sup>st</sup> year	105(34.3%)
	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	141(46.1%)
	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	60(19.6%)

Source: authors

### *Instruments and data gathering*

The data were collected through an *online survey* by using Google forms. Surveying online provides vast benefits for most of the researchers, since it has the potential to obtain larger set of data in the most efficient way, cost-effective, and can be accomplished in a relatively short time frame<sup>28</sup>. Additionally, there are two instruments that were utilized for this study. First is the *Festival Satisfaction Survey* developed by Yoon et al.<sup>12</sup> which measures the quality of a festival and its value affecting invitees' satisfaction and loyalty. It measures seven domains which are: IS, PG, FD, FT, FV, FS, and FL. The “souvenir” domain was excluded from the instrument since it is

not applicable in the current setting of the investigation. Responses are recorded in a 7-point Likert scale from 1- “strongly disagree” to 7- “strongly agree.” Lastly, the *Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire* developed by Eys et al.<sup>15</sup> was also utilized. It is an instrument that measures the sport environment experienced by students subdivided into two factors: TS, and SC. Responses are recorded in a 9-point Likert Scale from 1- “strongly disagree” to 9- “strongly agree.”

### Statistical analysis

A normality and reliability test, and bivariate correlation for each subscale of FSS and YSEQ was performed. For the normality test, most scales did not obtain the threshold value [2, -2], indicating that most of the responses across scales are not-normally distributed. Additionally, the results on the reliability test display a high-reliability score, with a Cronbach’s Alpha (CA) value ranging from .89 to .98, indicating that the instruments can be used for the investigation. Finally, a test of association across all subscales of FSS and YSEQ demonstrated a positive interrelatedness ( $p < .01$ ). Furthermore, as have stated earlier, the data are not normally distributed, indicating that a non-parametric test can be used to test the relationship between the two variables, and determining the significant variance in terms of FS and FL with respect to gender, age, and year level.

Furthermore, *Kruskal-Wallis H* was assumed in determining the significant variance concerning FS and FL with respect to various demographic characteristics of the respondents. In order to determine if the aforementioned statistical analysis may be used for this investigation, a non-parametric version of *Levene’s test of Homogeneity of Variances* was performed, with the assumption that the  $p$ -values should be  $>.05$ . Most of the  $p$ -values are  $>.05$ , indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of variance is not violated. Therefore, the use of *Kruskal-Wallis H* is warranted. On the one hand, the variable Festival Loyalty (year level) has a  $p$ -value of  $<.05$ . In this regard, the parametric version *One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)* should be used.

Additionally, to test the relationship between QVSE, FS, and FL, *Spearman Rho’s ( $r_s$ )* will be used. In this particular analysis, the constructs that comprises QVSE will be correlated to FL and FS. Lastly, to test the direct relation of QVSE to FS and FL, *Multiple Regression* analysis will be used.

## Results

After performing *Kruskal-Wallis H* analysis, Table 2 illustrates the results on the variance concerning festival satisfaction and loyalty with respect to gender, year level, and age group. First, in terms of gender, it was found that no significant variance was observed concerning FS [ $H(2) = 1.350, p = .509$ ], even those LGBTQIAP+ students has higher mean score (164.88), compared to female (155.75) and male (146.72) students; likewise, no significant difference observed concerning FL [ $H(2) = 1.620, p = .445$ ], even those LGBTQIAP+ students has higher mean score (168.78), compared to female (154.70) and male (147.20) students. Second, in terms of year level, it was found that no significant variance was observed concerning FS [ $H(2) = 4.234, p = .120$ ], even those LGBTQIAP+ students has higher mean score (172.63), compared to male (153.56) and female (145.32) students. Lastly, in terms of age group, it was observed that no significant difference was found concerning FS [ $H(2) = 1.200, p = .549$ ], even those 26 years old and above has a higher mean score (174.10), compared to those 19-22 (154.48) and 23-25 (143.71) years old; likewise, no significant difference was observed concerning FL [ $H(2) = 1.077, p = .584$ ], even those 26 years old and above (177.70) has a higher mean score, compared to those 19-22 (153.78) and 23-25 (146.70) years old. In general, across all gender and age groups, most of the students are equal in terms of their satisfaction level and loyalty scores toward the festival; except for year

level group, as it only analyzed FS of the respondents.

**Table 2.** Kruskal-Wallis H analysis of variance according to FS and FL with respect to gender, year level, and age group

	Gender		Year Level	Age Group	
	<i>Festival Satisfaction</i>	<i>Festival Loyalty</i>	<i>Festival Satisfaction</i>	<i>Festival Satisfaction</i>	<i>Festival Loyalty</i>
Kruskal-Wallis H	1.350	1.620	4.234	1.200	1.077
<i>df</i>	2	2	2	2	2
<i>Asymp. Sig.</i>	.509	.445	.120	.549	.584

Source: authors

Table 3 illustrates the One-way ANOVA results concerning the variance of FS in between groups with respect to year level. Based on the findings, a significant variance was observed in between groups [ $F(2, 303) = 3.91, p = .021$ ]. After performing post-hoc analysis using Tukey HSD test, it was observed that the mean score of 3<sup>rd</sup> year students ( $M = 6.21$   $SD = .98$ ) was significantly different than 1<sup>st</sup> year students ( $M = 5.71$   $SD = 1.55$ ) and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students ( $M = 5.55$   $SD = 1.72$ ). Therefore, it can be postulated that 3<sup>rd</sup> year students are more loyal towards the festival compared to 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students.

**Table 3.** One-way ANOVA analysis of variance according to FL with respect to year level

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<i>Festival Loyalty</i> (year level)	<b>Between Groups</b>	18.552	2	9.276	3.909	.021
	<b>Within Groups</b>	719.007	303	2.373		
	<b>Total</b>	737.559	305			

Source: authors

Table 4 typifies the result based on the relationship between all the constructs that comprises QVSE, FS, and FL. It was found that a positive significant relationship was observed between Informational Service (IS) and FS [ $r(304) = .756, p < .05$ ], and FL [ $r(304) = .765, p < .05$ ]; between Program (PG) and FS [ $r(304) = .819, p < .05$ ], and FL [ $r(304) = .834, p < .05$ ]; between Food (FD) and FS [ $r(304) = .664, p < .05$ ], and FL [ $r(304) = .605, p < .05$ ]; between Facility (FT) and FS [ $r(304) = .741, p < .05$ ], and FL [ $r(304) = .742, p < .05$ ]; between Festival Value (FV) and FS [ $r(304) = .845, p < .05$ ], and FL [ $r(304) = .824, p < .05$ ]; between Tasks (TS) and FS [ $r(304) = .794, p < .05$ ], and FL [ $r(304) = .827, p < .05$ ]; and, between Social (SC) and FS [ $r(304) = .581, p < .05$ ], and FL [ $r(304) = .623, p < .05$ ]. Overall, it can be concluded that Quality Value and Sport Environment has a positive and significant relationship with Festival Satisfaction and Festival Loyalty.

**Table 4.** Relationship between Quality Value and Sport Environment (QVSE), Festival Loyalty (FS), and Festival Loyalty (FL)

		Festival Satisfaction	Festival Loyalty
<b>Informational Service</b>	Correlation Coefficient	.756**	.765**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
<b>Program</b>	Correlation Coefficient	.819**	.834**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
<b>Food</b>	Correlation Coefficient	.664**	.645**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
<b>Facility</b>	Correlation Coefficient	.741**	.742**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
<b>Festival Value</b>	Correlation Coefficient	.845**	.824**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
<b>Tasks</b>	Correlation Coefficient	.794**	.827**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
<b>Social</b>	Correlation Coefficient	.581**	.623**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000

**Note:** \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Source:** authors

Finally, Table 5 exemplifies the results of the multiple regression analysis and hypothesis testing. First, it was found that QVSE predicts FS [ $F(7, 298) = 348.617, p < .001$ ], suggesting that QVSE has a direct and significant influence on FS. Additionally, the  $R^2 = .944$  displayed the model that 94.4% of the variance in FS. Aside from this, coefficients were analyzed to establish the degree to which each construct of QVSE contributes directly to FS. It was found that IS ( $\beta = .147, t = 3.008, p = .003$ ), PG ( $\beta = .236, t = 3.919, p < .001$ ), FV ( $\beta = .398, t = 7.302, p < .001$ ), TS ( $\beta = .256, t = 7.126, p < .000$ ), and SC ( $\beta = -.072, t = -3.448, p = .001$ ) are significantly related to FS. On the one hand, FD ( $\beta = -.043, t = -1.406, p = .161$ ) and FT ( $\beta = .028, t = .612, p = .541$ ) were found to have no significant relationship with FS. In general, it can be suggested that once QVSE along with its constructs influence FS and are highly accountable to the concerned relationship.

Second, it was also found that QVSE predicts FL [ $F(7, 298) = 348.474, p < .001$ ], signifying that QVSE has a direct and significant influence on FL. Also, the  $R^2 = .944$  displayed the model that 94.4% of the variance in FL. Moreover, the coefficients were scrutinized to determine the degree to which each construct of QVSE contributes significantly to FL. According to the findings, it was observed that IS ( $\beta = .099, t = 2.022, p = .044$ ), PG ( $\beta = .294, t = 4.886, p < .001$ ), FD ( $\beta = -.085, t = -2.761, p = .006$ ), FV ( $\beta = .290, t = 5.325, p < .001$ ), TS ( $\beta = .296, t = 8.240, p < .001$ ), and SC ( $\beta = -.047, t = -2.238, p = .026$ ) are significantly related to FL, except for FT ( $\beta = .083, t = 1.789, p = .075$ ). Overall, it can be suggested that all the constructs of QVSE highly influences FL and are highly responsible to the concerned relationship.

**Table 5.** Hypotheses testing and multiple regression results

Hypothesis	Regression weights	Beta Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>	F	t-value	p-value	Decision
<i>H<sub>1</sub></i>	QVSE → FS	-	.944	348.617	-	.000	Rejected
<i>H<sub>2</sub></i>	IS → FS	.147	-	-	3.008	.003	Accepted
<i>H<sub>3</sub></i>	PG → FS	.236	-	-	3.919	.000	Accepted
<i>H<sub>4</sub></i>	FD → FS	-.043	-	-	-1.406	.161	Rejected
<i>H<sub>5</sub></i>	FT → FS	.028	-	-	.612	.541	Rejected
<i>H<sub>6</sub></i>	FV → FS	.398	-	-	7.302	.000	Rejected
<i>H<sub>7</sub></i>	TS → FS	.256	-	-	7.126	.000	Rejected
<i>H<sub>8</sub></i>	SC → FS	-.072	-	-	-3.448	.001	Rejected
<i>H<sub>9</sub></i>	QVSE → FL	-	.944	348.474	-	.000	Rejected
<i>H<sub>10</sub></i>	IS → FL	.099	-	-	2.022	.044	Accepted

Hypothesis	Regression weights	Beta Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>	F	t-value	p-value	Decision
H <sub>11</sub>	PG → FL	.294	-	-	4.886	.000	Accepted
H <sub>12</sub>	FD → FL	-.085	-	-	-2.761	.006	Accepted
H <sub>13</sub>	FT → FL	.083	-	-	1.789	.075	Rejected
H <sub>14</sub>	FV → FL	.290	-	-	5.325	.000	Accepted
H <sub>15</sub>	TS → FL	.296	-	-	8.240	.000	Rejected
H <sub>16</sub>	SC → FL	-.047	-	-	-2.238	.026	Rejected

Note: p < .05. QVSE- Quality, Value and Sport Environment, IS- Informational Service, PG- Program, FD- Food, FT- Facility, FV- Festival Value, TS- Tasks, SC- Social, FS- Festival Satisfaction, FL- Festival Loyalty.

Source: authors

## Discussion

The analysis of variance showed no significant difference in festival satisfaction by gender, year level, or age. Various tourism scholarly papers have examined gender differences in festival or tourist destination enjoyment. According to Kwok et al.<sup>29</sup>, in Malaysia's tourist business, women's service quality views affect overall satisfaction more than men's. In the Azores Islands, Vieira et al.<sup>30</sup> found gendered variations in visitors' pleasure with beaches and other coastal bathing locations. Few scholarly research has examined gender disparities in sports festival pleasure. The study of Gokce and Bozyigit<sup>31</sup>, 1,274 randomly selected respondents who attended a municipality's sports festival in Denizli, Turkey, male participants reported high satisfaction in program, value, satisfaction, and loyalty. Results show high satisfaction and gender differences vary by study. The above research found gender differences in festival or tourism destination satisfaction. This study found that festival attendees of all genders (males, females, LGBTQIAP+s) were more satisfied. On one side, research studies on year level and age group disparities in sports festival enjoyment is still undocumented.

Besides year level, gender and age groups have not significantly affected festival loyalty. The study of Hsu et al.<sup>32</sup> segmented the local and international food festivalgoers at the Macau International food festival by gender based on experiential value. Festival organizers and marketers should note that this research establishes three underlying features of experience value and groups four culinary festivalgoer segments by experiential value. Each category differed in age, education, and geography. More crucially, the multi-experiential value group had the highest festival pleasure, delight, and loyalty. Furthermore, the research investigation of Başarangil et al.<sup>26</sup> confirmed that festival loyalty differs by gender among attendees of the International Culture and Şile Cloth in Turkey. Additionally, Başarangil et al.<sup>26</sup> found that local festival loyalty was highest among 18-24-year-olds and lowest among 45-year-olds. These studies have little to do with college students and sports festivals. Interestingly, year-level groups differed significantly. Except for year level, most students have a higher loyalty score to the sport festival regardless of gender or age. Since this study is new, it is encouraged to replicate it at other higher education institutions. Importantly, other educational scholars and practitioners from diverse higher education institutions may be interested in doing a comparable study to verify or refute this study's results.

QVSE positively correlated with FS and FL. FS and FL are strongly correlated with IS, PG, FD, FT, and FV in festival quality and value. As the festival's quality and worth increase, so do students' satisfaction and loyalty to it. These variables have been linked in multiple tourism and festival industry research. For instance, Culha<sup>33</sup> found that the International Olive Festival in Didim, Turkey, organizers' event quality strongly influences visitors' satisfaction and propensity to recommend the festival. The study Cheng et al.<sup>34</sup> also discovered that perceived quality directly affected travellers' pleasure at Taiwan's Lantern Festival. As indicated, festival enjoyment strongly influences festival loyalty. Also, the new Sports Environment, TS, and SC variables strongly linked with FS and FS. In this regard, if students had favorable festival tasks and social benefits, their pleasure and loyalty possibly increased. On one hand, this investigation is new and



no studies have been conducted. Therefore, a comparable investigation to deepen the link between these variables is recommended.

QVSE were regressed to FS and FL. FS is predicted by QVSE. IS, FV, TS, and SC directly affect FS. The quality of information, value, tasks, and social factors offered to students may directly affect their sports festival enjoyment. Scholars studying different festivals or events have supported this study's findings<sup>35,36</sup>. On one hand, FD and FT did not influence FS. TS and SC directly affect FS, which is interesting. Positive task- and social-experiences may directly affect students' festival enjoyment. FD and FT did not impact FS. The findings contradicted other scholars<sup>37</sup>. QVSE also predicts FL, with the exception of FT, IS, PG, FD, and FV directly influence student FL. This study complements previous findings that perceived quality and value affect festival or celebration guests' loyalty<sup>38,39</sup>. FL was also directly affected by TS and SC. Tasks and enjoyable peer interactions may increase students' FL. There are no current investigations related to this subject, hence its findings are inconclusive. Thus, the authors of this study urge that other educational scholars conduct a comparable study to verify these findings, particularly in higher education. It also highlights the two new variables in this study from the Sports Environment, namely TS and SC. These two constructs should be examined alongside festival quality and value to further understand how these aspects influence FS and FL.

## Conclusion

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that QVSE, combination of Festival Quality, Value, and Sport Environment has a direct influence on Festival Satisfaction and Festival Loyalty of students. The quality of services, as well as the tasks and social benefits of the festival, provided by the students and administration to students can greatly contribute to the continuous engagement of students to various sports activities. In this regard, it can be suggested that the school may continuously offer such activities to students in promoting healthy living, positive relationship with other students, and to offer enjoyment and relaxation. On the one side, this study has some limitations that needs to be taken into consideration. This study is limited to students who participated in the recent organized sports festival Magbaláue 2022: "Reset and Rebuild: Accelerate, Close the Gap." This has been the first sports festival organized by the school after the onslaught of COVID-19 pandemic. In this regard, the findings of this study may not be able to generalize the entire studentry of the school, as well as other HEIs in the country and in a global scale. In this regard, this study suggests that a similar study may be performed since no prior studies were conducted in relation to this present investigation. To conclude, this study adds new information to the body of knowledge and to fill up the scarcity of papers that were conducted in relation to this current investigation.

## References

1. Báez-Montenegro A, Devesa-Fernández M. Motivation, satisfaction and loyalty in the case of a film festival: differences between local and non-local participants. *J. Cult. Econ.* 2017;41(2):173–95. DOI: 10.1007/s10824-017-9292-2
2. Chang S, Gibson H, Sisson L. The loyalty process of residents and tourists in the festival context. *Curr. Issues Tour.* 2014;17(9):783–99. DOI: 10.1080/13683500.2013.768214
3. Romano L, Angelini G, Consiglio P, Fiorilli C. The Effect of Students' Perception of Teachers' Emotional Support on School Burnout Dimensions: Longitudinal Findings. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18(4):1922. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph18041922
4. Stevens M, Lieschke J, Cruwys T, Cárdenas D, Platow MJ, Reynolds KJ. Better together: How group-based physical activity protects against depression. *Soc Sci Med.* 202;286:114337. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114337

5. Eather N, Wade L, Pankowiak A, Eime R. The impact of sports participation on mental health and social outcomes in adults: a systematic review and the ‘Mental Health through Sport’ conceptual model. *Syst Rev*. 2023;12(1):102. DOI: 10.1186/s13643-023-02264-8
6. Giray LG. The Spirit of Sport: Exploring Sportsmanship among Physical Education Students. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education*. 2021;3(2):257–66. DOI: 10.30650/ajte.v3i2.2232
7. Mohi Z, Wu J, Wong J. A study of food festival loyalty. In: *Proceedings of the International Hospitality & Tourism Postgraduate Conference 2013*. CRC Press; 2013:589–93. DOI: 10.1201/b16064-119
8. Abdou AH, Mohamed SAK, Khalil AAF, Albakhit AI, Alarjani AJN. Modeling the relationship between perceived service quality, tourist satisfaction, and tourists’ behavioral intentions amid COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence of yoga tourists’ perspectives. *Front Psychol*. 2022;13. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1003650
9. Baker DA, Crompton JL. Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Ann Tour Res*. 2000;27(3):785–804. DOI: 10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5
10. Alén-González E, Rodríguez-Campo L, Fraiz-Brea JA, Louredo-Lorenzo M. Multidimensional Analysis of Predictors of Behavioral Intentions in Music Festivals Using Environmental Psychology. *Event Manag.*. 2023;27(3):367–88. DOI: 10.3727/152599522X16419948695215
11. Aşan K, Kaptangil K, Gargacı Kinay A. Mediating role of perceived festival value in the relationship between experiences and satisfaction. *International Int. J. Event Festiv. Manag.* 2020;11(2):255–71. DOI: 10.1108/IJEFM-11-2019-0058
12. Yoon YS, Lee JS, Lee CK. Measuring festival quality and value affecting visitors’ satisfaction and loyalty using a structural approach. *Int J Hosp Manag.* 2010;29(2):335–42. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.10.002
13. Molina-Gómez J, Mercadé-Melé P, Almeida-García F, Ruiz-Berrón R. New perspectives on satisfaction and loyalty in festival tourism: The function of tangible and intangible attributes. *PLoS One*. 2021 ;16(2):e0246562. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0246562
14. Hognestad HK, Giulianotti R, Thorpe H, Langseth T, Gils B. Editorial: Environmental Sustainability in Sports, Physical Activity and Education, and Outdoor Life. *Front Sports Act Living*. 2022;4 DOI: 10.3389/fspor.2022.853599
15. Eys M, Loughhead T, Bray SR, Carron A V. Development of a Cohesion Questionnaire for Youth: The Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire. *J Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2009;31(3):390–408. DOI: 10.1123/jsep.31.3.390
16. Fernandez R, Ibañez S, Rotas JC, Velasco RJ, Lobo J, Celis ML. Physical activity barriers and team cohesiveness of Angeles City volleyball players during the pandemic. *Edu Sportivo: Indonesian j. of Physical Education*. 2022;3(3):255–68. DOI: 10.25299/es:ijope.2022.vol3(3).10450
17. Gu S, Xue L. Relationships among Sports Group Cohesion, Psychological Collectivism, Mental Toughness and Athlete Engagement in Chinese Team Sports Athletes. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19(9):4987. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph19094987
18. Mikaelsson K, Rutberg S, Lindqvist AK, Michaelson P. Physically inactive adolescents’ experiences of engaging in physical activity. *Eur J Physiother*. 2020;22(4):191–6. DOI: 10.1080/21679169.2019.1567808
19. Ramukumba T. Visitor satisfaction at a local festival: An analysis of the Strawberry festival in George, South Africa. *Afr. j. hosp. tour. leis*. 2019[cited March 10 2024] ;8(3). Available from: [https://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article\\_3\\_vol\\_8\\_3\\_2019.pdf](https://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_3_vol_8_3_2019.pdf)
20. Choo H, Ahn K, F. Petrick J. An integrated model of festival revisit intentions. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*. 2016;28(4):818–38. DOI: 10.1108/IJCHM-09-2014-0448
21. Heung VCS. Satisfaction levels of mainland Chinese travelers with Hong Kong hotel services. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.* 2000;12(5):308–15. DOI: 10.1108/09596110010339689
22. Palací F, Salcedo A, Topa G. Cognitive and affective antecedents of consumers’ satisfaction: A systematic review of two research approaches. *Sustainability*. 2019;11(2):431. DOI: 10.3390/su11020431
23. Lee C chang, Yeh W chih, Chang H chung, Yu Z, Tsai Z yang. Influence of individual cognition, satisfaction, and the theory of planned behavior on tenant loyalty. *Front Psychol*. 2022;13. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.882490
24. Tkaczynski A, Rundle-Thiele S, Arli D, Gill C. Going . . . Going . . . Going . . . Not Yet Gone! Enhancing Small-scale Festival Survival. *Event Management*. 2022;26(3):513–29. DOI: 10.3727/152599521X16288665119422
25. Wang L, Li X. The five influencing factors of tourist loyalty: A meta-analysis. Shafi M, editor. *PLoS One*. 2023;18(4):e0283963. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0283963
26. Başarangel İ, Metin T, Tokatlı C. The investigation of festival loyalty of local public according to demographic variables. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*. 2020 Sep 30;8(3):1712–23. DOI: 10.21325/jotags.2020.630
27. Giaccone S, Galvagno M. Small-scale cultural festivals in Southern Europe: A motivation-based segmentation study. *Eur. J. Tour. Res*. 2021;29:2902. DOI: 10.54055/ejtr.v29i.2413
28. Regmi PR, Waithaka E, Paudyal A, Simkhada P, Van Teijlingen E. Guide to the design and application of online questionnaire surveys. *Nepal J Epidemiol*. 2017;6(4):640–4. DOI: 10.3126/nje.v6i4.17258

29. Kwok SY, Jusoh A, Khalifah Z. The influence of service quality on satisfaction: Does gender really matter? *Intangible Capital*. 2016;12(2):444. DOI: 10.3926/ic.673
30. Vieira JAC, Silva FJF, Teixeira JCA. Gender and tourist satisfaction: The case of sunbathers in the Azores Islands. *Rev. Port. Estud. Reg.* 2022;61:135–49. Available from: <https://www.review-rper.com/index.php/rper/article/download/536/438>
31. Gokce H, Bozyigit E. Satisfaction Levels of Sports Event Participants. *J. Educ. Learn.* 2020;9(1):136. DOI: 10.5539/jel.v9n1p136
32. Hsu FC, Park SH, Miller JC. Segmenting food festivalgoers: experiential value, emotional state and loyalty. *Br Food J.* 2023;125(1):29–48. DOI: 10.1108/BFJ-05-2021-0549
33. Culha O. The effect of food festival quality on place attachment and destination recommendation intention through festival experience and festival satisfaction: The case of the Didim International Olive Festival. *J. Conv. Event Tour.* 2020;21(5):387–416. DOI: 10.1080/15470148.2020.1775743
34. Cheng JS, Shih HY, Chen CH. Festival revisiting intention and quality: The case of Taiwan’s Lantern Festival. *Univers. J. Manag.* 2016;4(10):575–80. DOI: 10.13189/ujm.2016.041007
35. Zunan S, Purwoko, Ari S, Sasongko AH, Pratiwi R, Adiyono. Antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction in the context of special occasion at trade exhibitions and the halal business in indonesia: A method based on partial least squares (pls) path modeling. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Social, Economics, Business, and Education (ICSEBE 2021)*. 2022. p. 97–103. DOI: 10.2991/aebmr.k.220107.020
36. Armbrecht J. Event quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioural intentions in an event context. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* 2021;21(2):169–91. DOI: 10.1080/15022250.2021.1877191
37. Chang M, Kim JH, Kim D. The effect of food tourism behavior on Food Festival Visitor’s revisit intention. *Sustainability*. 2018 Oct 1;10(10):3534. DOI: 10.3390/su10103534
38. Yen I yin, Yu H “Alvin.” How festival brand equity influences loyalty: The mediator effect of satisfaction. *J. Conv. Event Tour.* 2022;23(4):343–61. DOI: 10.1080/15470148.2022.2067606
39. Bringas-Rábago NL, Toudert D. Quality, expenditure, and loyalty in a cultural event: A longitudinal study. *Int. J. Tour. Cities.* 2023;ahead-of-print. DOI: 10.1108/IJTC-04-2022-0080

**ORCID**Joseph Lobo: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2553-467X>Diana Varona: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5526-5039>**Editor:** Carlos Herold Junior

Received on Nov 03, 2023.

Reviewed on Jan 28, 2024.

Accepted on March 05, 2024.

---

**Corresponding author:** Joseph Lobo. Email: [joseph.lobo@bulsu.edu.ph](mailto:joseph.lobo@bulsu.edu.ph)