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Abstract

The current study explores the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. The goal of this research is to identify the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Generation Z comprises those who were born between the years of 1995 and 2009 (e.g., Goh and Lee, 2018). This area is largely under-researched, especially in Ireland. This study investigated early Generation Z, those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of the present study. A mixed method approach was utilised in the current study. A sample of early Generation Z festival-goers (n=131) completed an online self-administered survey which measured a number of variables related to the motivations and behaviours of this sample, in relation to festivals. Qualitative interviews were subsequently carried out with three industry leaders in the festival industry and tourism sector in Ireland to gain a deeper insight into the topic.

The quantitative data analysis, which incorporated Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), revealed a number of novel findings and statistically significant relationships. External Socialisation was found to have a direct effect on Flow which was medium in size. Event Anticipation was also found to have a direct effect on Flow which was medium in size. Flow was found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. Flow was also found to mediate the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. The qualitative data contributed to supporting a number of this study’s findings but similarly, provided insight and facilitated the emergence of findings independent of the quantitative findings. For example, findings relating to Generation Z’s behaviour, and relating to how to cater for this generation, in the context of festivals, emerged from the qualitative data.

This research study aimed to decipher the motivations and behaviours of the cohort, in order to try to identify their wants and ensure the continued success of the festival industry in Ireland. The current study has identified a number of findings which will add to the body of existing knowledge in the field of festival motivation research, and there are several practical findings which will be of use to those operating in the festival industry. Included here is the importance of the integration of various aspects of the festival content which are un-related to headline acts. In addition, as this study was exploratory, a number of avenues for further research have been identified and it would be worthwhile to explore these as Generation Z continue to graduate into adulthood and become financially independent festival-goers.
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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YSI</td>
<td>The Young Social Innovators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Structural Equation Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITIC</td>
<td>Irish Tourism Industry Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEBS</td>
<td>Method of Empathy-based Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMO</td>
<td>Destination Management Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMA</td>
<td>County and City Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWOM</td>
<td>Electronic Word of Mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Small Island Destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Experience Sampling Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>Flow State Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>Variable Inflation Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Exploratory Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSV</td>
<td>Maximum Variance Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Average Variance Extracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTMT</td>
<td>Heterotrait-Monotrait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLF</td>
<td>Common Latent Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The current study explores the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland and identifies motivations and behaviours of this cohort. The research question of the current study is: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ Generation Z comprises individuals who were born between the years of 1995 and 2009 (e.g., Goh and Lee, 2018). Thus, the eldest of this cohort will turn 25 this year (2020). They are gradually gaining employment or working (e.g., Randstad, 2016). At the time of the 2016 ROI census, this generation made up approximately 20% of the population in Ireland (CSO, 2016). Generation Z are an intriguing cohort, and while they are under-researched in Ireland, this is especially pertinent in the context of festivals in Ireland. The current study is the first of its kind in Ireland. It is an innovative exploratory study which endeavours to determine the motivations and behaviours of this cohort, in order to try to determine their needs and wants and ensure the continued success of the festival industry in Ireland. The current study’s area of focus was appealing for a number of reasons. Firstly, it was identified that there exists a sparsity of literature focusing on the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z in relation to festivals in Ireland. The researcher is passionate about the event and festival industry and it was evident from the outset that generating knowledge about the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland would be of significant value to the industry, as well as to the field of festival motivation research. The timeliness of this research, given that the earliest members of Generation Z are turning or have turned 25 this year and are set to become increasingly financially independent, the potential the research had to generate valuable knowledge about this market of festival-goers, as well as the potential impact it could make to progress the success of the event and festival industry overall, made it a very appealing area on which to focus.

A number of characteristics have emerged in the literature pertaining to Generation Z. Generation Z can be differentiated from other generations in a number of ways. Firstly, they are the first generation to have lived in a world
where the Internet has always existed (Prensky, 2001 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104). They were growing up when the last recession, which started in 2008, occurred and may be observers of the stress of those who parent them, in association with money (Turner, 2015). This cohort is suggested to be “diverse” in terms of race and ethnicity, to the greatest degree to date (Fry and Parker, 2018, p.3). In Ireland, research has found that this generation are “stressed” (The Young Social Innovators (YSI) and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.6). A sample that participated in Irish research believe that life is more challenging for them as teenagers currently, with the primary reason for this suggested to be the pressure to perform academically (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). The second and third explanations for this are associated with social media (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). There is limited research on this cohort, who are continuing to graduate into adulthood in Ireland, and this research endeavours to determine their motivations and behaviours in relation to festivals in Ireland. The present study used a sample of 18 to 23 year olds, as this is the age-group whom generally attend festivals. This age-group currently are considered to be early Generation Z. A secondary consideration was the fact that parental consent would not need to be attained for this cohort to participate in the research, as they were able to give consent themselves.

There is a myriad of research studies in existence in relation to the motives of attendees who attend festivals or events, however, the motives of Generation Z attendees in relation to festivals or events in Ireland are largely under-researched. Similarly, there appears to be a dearth of literature in relation to festival behaviour. Festivals are of significant importance to Ireland in terms of their ability to showcase culture, residents of Ireland and locations all around Ireland in such a positive way to tourists who visit the country (Sugrue, 2018, cited in Fáilte Ireland, 2018, n.p.). Over 200,000 tourists came to Ireland each year due to festivals and events and this resulted in an addition to the Irish economy of over one hundred million euro annually (Fáilte Ireland, 2019), pre-Covid-19. Given the significance of festivals in Ireland, before the outbreak of Coronavirus, this research was considered of importance at this time, especially as Generation Z begin to become financially independent. Many festivals in Ireland are dependent on grants and other sources of funding and cannot afford to invest in the type of beneficial research that is being carried out in the current
study. This type of research may help them to ensure their festival will appeal to this generational cohort. It was hoped that this research will be of benefit to those both in the music and community festival fields to ensure that this generation continue to attend and participate in festivals in Ireland.

1.2 Research Objectives

Table 1.1 The research objectives of the current study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To determine the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>To evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how Generation Z festival-goers interact with festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>To appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers' level of attendance and participation at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers' behaviour at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To identify the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Overview of the current study

1.3.1 Chapter 1

Chapter 1, the Introduction chapter, outlines the rationale for the current research. It also outlines the research objectives in relation to the current research, and gives an overview of each chapter within this document.

1.3.2 Chapter 2

Chapter 2 consists of a literature review pertaining to the topics at hand. This chapter should give the reader a comprehensive overview of the existing literature pertaining to this research. Firstly, the rationale for this research is outlined in this chapter. Literature pertaining to Generation Z is explored which will give the reader an overview of the current suggested characteristics of this generational cohort and the findings in relation to various samples of Generation Z in existing research. There is a focus on various aspects of the lives of Generation Z and what has been found to date in relation to these aspects, such as their social media use, their stress levels, some of their views in relation to
politics and society and so forth. In addition, literature in relation to events and festivals is identified and discussed. Specifically, event typologies are discussed, literature relating to events and festivals as elements of tourism strategy are discussed, areas such as the social and economic impacts of festivals are explored, research pertaining to event and festival motivation is outlined and, among other areas, the concept of the Experience Economy is also addressed. Literature pertaining to various constructs which are measured within the current research is also explored in this chapter.

1.3.3 Chapter 3
Chapter 3 will describe why a mixed method approach was chosen. In addition, this chapter will identify the research objectives and research questions related to the current study. It will describe the epistemological perspective of the current study, the two samples that participated in the current study and how the quantitative and qualitative data collection was undertaken. It will also highlight the ethical considerations relating to these two data collection stages. Other areas included in this chapter are, for example, the method used for calculating an appropriate sample size and the limitations of the methodology used.

1.3.4 Chapter 4
Chapter 4 outlines the findings of the present study. This chapter meets the objectives of the research (see Table 1.1) and outlines findings in relation to each of these objectives. Firstly, the descriptive statistics are presented and these statistics outline the demographics of the quantitative sample that participated in this research. The overall mean scores for each construct are outlined. Next, the results of the comparison of groups are presented. Subsequently, the order of operations involved in Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) are outlined, and the results of same are presented. As described above, the findings related to each objective will be presented. Limitations in relation to the results are also outlined here.

1.3.5 Chapter 5
Chapter 5, the Discussion and Analysis chapter, discusses the key findings which were presented in the Findings chapter, chapter 4. A number of the findings are
discussed in terms of the extent to which they contribute to answering the research question, which is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ In the Discussion and Analysis chapter, the findings are discussed in the context of the literature that already exists in relation to the findings. Areas for further research are identified in this chapter as some of the research constructs and findings were novel and further investigation would be warranted regarding same.

1.3.6 Chapter 6
Chapter 6 is the concluding chapter, which synopsises the contribution of the current study to the literature, the key findings for festival stakeholders and similarly identifies avenues which may be worthy of further research.

1.4 Limitations of the research
Although this research met its objectives, it was not without some limitations. Below are some of the main limitations associated with the current study. The limitations of the current study will be outlined in greater detail within chapter 3 and chapter 4.

1.4.1 Timeframe of the research
The first limitation pertains to the fact that had the research been conducted over a longer period of time, greater insights may have been gained as a larger sample could have been recruited to participate.

1.4.2 Dissemination of online self-administered survey
Another limitation was related to how the survey was disseminated. It may have been preferable to attend festivals and ask Generation Z to answer the survey in relation to their experience at given festivals, as opposed to asking them to recall a festival experience retrospectively.

1.4.3 Age range of participants
A further limitation exists in relation to the fact that 18 to 23 year olds were recruited to participate in this study. When this research began in 2018, 23 year olds were the eldest members of Gen Z. In 2019, when the survey was
disseminated, it was open to 18 to 23 year old prospective participants, when in fact some of the eldest members of Generation Z would have turned 24 at that point, and could have participated. This could have resulted in a larger sample of participants also. One positive element of this is that a gap now exists between the participants who participated and the youngest Millennials, so the results may be more distinctly related to Generation Z than if it had included participants who were closer to the age of the youngest Millennials. There are a number of further limitations and these will be outlined in detail in the subsequent chapters.

1.5 Key findings emerging from the current study

The current study’s goal was to identify the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. A myriad of important and relevant findings emerged from the current study. These included, but were not limited to, the finding that the proposed Structural Equation Model explains 45% of the variance in Attendance among the sample of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland who participated in this study, with particular reference to the following combinations of statistically significant predictor variables: Flow, Event Attractions and Event Anticipation. Each of these three predictors demonstrated an almost equal moderate magnitude impact upon Attendance. The other proposed predictors of Attendance, namely Perceived Popularity and Social Capital, revealed an approximate zero prediction effect. In addition, the proposed Structural Equation Model explains 50% of the variance in Event Anticipation among the sample of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland who participated in the current study, with equal reference and magnitude to the following statistically significant predictors, Event Attractiveness, Known Group Socialisation, Social Capital, External Socialisation, Flow and to a lesser extent, Perceived Popularity.

Flow, Event Anticipation and Event Attractions were each found to have a significant direct effect upon Attendance, with a small effect size in each case. Event Attractions, Known Group Socialisation and External Socialisation were each found to have significant direct effects upon Event Anticipation. The sizes of each of these direct effects were also small. External Socialisation and Event
Attractions each had a significant direct effect upon Flow, the effect size of which were both medium.

In terms of indirect effects, Flow was found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. In addition, Flow was found to mediate the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance.

In terms of moderation, it was found that Inhibition strengthens the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation. In addition, with regards to Social Capital, it was found that scores for the female sample of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland who participated in the current study, were significantly higher than were those for the male sample of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland who participated in the current study. However, such group comparisons were carried out before the constructs were validated, so the results relate to constructs which were not yet validated.

A number of other key findings emerged relating to Generation Z’s behavioural characteristics, such as in relation to their tendency towards being economical consumers and in relation to their tendency to be savvy in a number of different contexts.

Finally, it was found that there are elements of the festival experience that have grown in importance and it is suggested that the importance of the headline acts at festivals has dwindled. Facilities such as Wi-Fi and phone charging stations were found to be of importance among Generation Z.

1.6 Conclusion
This body of research outlines the findings of both quantitative data collected from a sample of Generation Z festival-goers and qualitative findings from leaders in the festival sector and tourism industry, with regards to the motives and behaviours of Gen Z festival-goers in Ireland. As previously mentioned, this area appears to be under-researched, especially in Ireland. Given the importance of festivals to the tourism industry in Ireland, it is hoped that the findings of this research will be of use to stakeholders within the festival sector in Ireland – both
stakeholders of music and community festivals. It is hoped that the findings will be used to enhance festivals for this generation in Ireland, so that the continued success of the festival industry is ensured. It is also intended that this research will bridge what appears to be a gap in the field of festival motivation research that exists in relation to the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.
Literature Review

2.1 Introduction
The literature review of the current study is intended to give the reader a very thorough insight into what is currently known about the topics under investigation in this research. The goal of the current research is to identify the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Thus, the current study’s goal to answer the following research question: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’. The following chapter will review literature pertaining to a number of areas. These will include, but will not be limited to, literature about generations, Generation Z and a number of different aspects in relation to this generation. This chapter will identify research pertaining to the area of festivals and events, and will outline existing research in relation to constructs such as Social Capital and Flow. It will then describe existing literature pertaining to areas such as motivations and behaviours. It is hoped that the following literature review will give the reader a perceptive overview of the existing literature pertaining to the topics at hand.

At the time of the last ROI census, Generation Z represented approximately twenty per cent of the Irish population (CSO, 2016). Goh and Lee (2018) suggest that Generation Z includes those individuals who were born between the years of 1995 and 2009, and that the majority utilise these years to define Generation Z.

2.2 Rationale for this research
This paper investigates the motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Firstly, the rationale for this research includes the fact that this area is significantly under-researched. Randstad (2016), in a report entitled ‘Gen Z and Millennials collide at work’ suggested that Generation Z are gradually gaining employment or working. Therefore, it could be suggested that this group are gradually attaining their own spending power. Thus, they are the festival-goers of now and of the next few decades and it is imperative that more is known about this cohort and their motivations and behaviours in relation to festivals, in order to help ensure that the festival industry continues to thrive, as it had been before the outbreak of Covid-19. The full fall out from the Covid-19 pandemic is not yet known, especially in terms of what its impact will be upon
the festival industry. Festivals and events make significant impressions in the places in which they are held (e.g., The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015; Mottiari, Quinn and Ryan, 2014), and some of these will be described in the sections to follow relating to the economic benefits and social benefits of festivals and events. The Irish Tourism Industry Confederation (ITIC) (2018) suggests that, at the time of writing their report, the tourism industry employed in the region of two hundred and thirty thousand individuals in Ireland. Two major events have occurred since this report was published, namely the progression of Brexit and the aforementioned Covid-19 outbreak. While the report makes note of the growth that Ireland has experienced in the five years previous to the publishing of this report, it does note that events do take place (e.g., “9/11”, “SARS” (ITIC, 2018, p.7)) which mean that an “upward trajectory” (ITIC, 2018, p.7) of growth is not without set backs. Brexit is given as an example of “the most recent external shock” (ITIC, 2018, p.7). While the management of the difficulties that emerge in association with Brexit is explored in this document (ITIC, 2018, pp.66-75), the outbreak of Covid-19 most especially will have effects that will strongly impact this course of progress that the authors of this document will not have foreseen or accounted for. Fáilte Ireland’s (n.d) Tourism Development & Innovation - A Strategy for Investment 2016 – 2022 report suggests that tourism employee numbers equate to eleven per cent of the work force in Ireland. Economically, it adds six billion euro plus to our economy in Ireland and four per cent of Ireland’s Gross National Product derives from tourism (Fáilte Ireland, n.d.). Getz (2005 cited in Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016, p.819) alludes to the progression of festivals in the last three to four decades. Festivals are suggested to be the reason that over two hundred thousand tourists enter Ireland from abroad annually and they make an economic impact of one hundred and eight million euro annually (Fáilte Ireland, 2019). Therefore, given the importance of festivals, an investigation of early Generation Z’s motivations and behaviours in relation to festivals in Ireland is considered to be of significant value at this time, given the lack of existing knowledge in this area. While there is plentiful existing research in the area of festival attendee motives, there appears to be scant existing literature focusing on the motives of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. In addition, there appears to be a paucity of literature on festival behaviour.
2.3 What is a Generation?

A generation has been referred to as “some form of social ‘proximity’ to shared events or cultural phenomenon” (Parry and Urwin, 2011, p.84 cited in Turner, 2015, p.103). Kupperschmidt (2000) suggests that those within a given generation experience similar events during their lifetimes and this leads to them having a set of traits which are generalisable to the generational group. However “individual differences within generations do exist.” (Kupperschmidt, 2000, p.66). It is suggested by Kupperschmidt (2000, p.66) that these “[g]enerational characteristics include relatively enduring values, attitudes, preferences, and behaviors that form the filter through which cohorts interpret subsequent life experiences”. Twenge et al. (2010 cited in Goh and Lee, 2018, p.21) propose that generation theory takes it that if the mean standard for a generation is used, what exemplifies the typical individuals within the same generation can be comprehended at a greater level. Previous generations have been categorised as follows: Traditionalists (also known as The Silent Generation), who were born approximately between 1922 and 1945, the Baby Boomers, who were born approximately between 1946 and 1964, Generation X, who were born approximately between 1965 and 1977, Millennials, who were born approximately between 1977 and 1993 (Taylor and Keeter, 2010 cited in Turner, 2015, p.103). Turner’s (2015) paper also suggests that Generation Z were born approximately between 1993 and 2005 (Turner, 2015). Other researchers suggest that Generation Z includes those who were born between the years of 1995 and 2009 (e.g., Goh and Lee, 2018). Following Generation Z is Generation Alpha, the generational cohort who were born or will be born between 2010 and 2025 (Dupont, 2019).

Table 2.1 What is a generation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation name(s)</th>
<th>Approximate years between which this generation is born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>Year Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Alpha</td>
<td>2010 – 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Constanza (2018) puts forward the notion that the concept of a ‘generation’ is of no consequence, in contrast, Spahiu’s (2016) writings intended to display that “the social generation concept, when accurately formulated, is an important tool, empirically as well as in theory, for academics who seek a richer, more methodical data of how and why societies are transformed through cohort substitution” (Spahiu, 2016, p.74). Spahiu, 2016 (p.74) also suggests that “the generation” in theory is absolutely necessary “in understandings of how societies change over time” (Spahiu, 2016, p.74).
2.4 Preceding Generation Z - Millennials

Pew Research Center take the year 1996 as the end-point for Millennials, suggesting that 1997 is the start-point for Generation Z (Dimock, 2019). Reasons for this include the fact that many significant events took place during the years in which Millennials grew up which “define the Millennial generation’s formative years.” (Dimock, 2019, n.p.). The research organisation suggest that this is apt as most Millennials will have realised the ramifications of 9/11, given their age range when it occurred, whereas the majority of those from Generation Z will not remember it happening (Dimock, 2019). Millennials have lived through war time and this has had political ramifications to this day (Dimock, 2019). In addition, Millennials lived through the election of President Obama, who was the “first black president” (Dimock, 2019, n.p.), an event that is suggested to have occurred due to the contribution of young voters. It is suggested that the majority of this generation were aged between twelve and twenty-seven years old at the time (Dimock, 2019). In addition, a volume of Millennials joined the working world during the economic downturn, which had a significant impact on their lives (Dimock, 2019). Dimock (2019) notes while Millennials are “diverse” (Dimock, 2019, n.p.) in terms of race and ethnicity, in comparison to generations that have gone before them, Generation Z is proposed to be “diverse” (Dimock, 2019, n.p.) to an even greater degree.

In relation to Millennials and festivals, Rivera, Semrad and Croes (2015) found that among Generation Y festival visitors, the domain which consisted of 5 E’s (Education, Entertainment, Escapism and Esthetics plus Economic value) explained eighty-eight per cent of the variance in “memorable experience” (p.103) for a sample of Millennial attendees at a festival in Aruba in the Caribbean, which is called the “Electric Music Festival” (Rivera, Semrad and Croes, 2015, p.99). It was found that “[t]he memorable experience dimensions explained 63 percent of the variance for the behavioral intentions” (Rivera, Semrad and Croes, 2015, p.103). It is suggested that “[t]he memorable experience has triggered a strong behavioral intention to return to and recommend the destination and the festival to others.” (Rivera, Semrad and Croes, 2015, p.103).

2.5 Generation Z

Although it could be concluded that an exact consensus has not been reached
within the literature regarding the years within which Generation Z was born (e.g., Vercelletto, 2019, Amárach Research, n.d.), for the purposes of this study, the definition describing Generation Z as those who were born between the years of 1995 and 2009, as suggested by Goh and Lee (2018) to be utilised by the majority, will be used. Generation Z is also referred to as the “internet generation” (Ozkan and Solmaz, 2015, p.93), the “iGeneration”, “Net Generation”, “Generation Next” and the “Quiet Generation” (Euromonitor International, 2011, p.6). They have not lived in a world where the Internet has not existed (Prensky, 2001 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104). For the purposes of this paper, the operational term ‘early Generation Z’ will be used to describe the sample under investigation, those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of this exploratory study.

2.5.1 Overview of the characteristics of Generation Z

Existing literature focusing on Generation Z has identified a number of characteristics associated with the cohort. Figure 1.1 shows various characteristics of Generation Z that have been identified in the literature.

![Figure 1.1 Characteristics of Generation Z](image)

Turner (2015) suggests that Generation Z may have an enhanced international cognisance due to their experiences of war in their early lives, however they may also see the world as dangerous. Given that they may have observed difficulties
associated with money in their childhoods, where they lived, it is suggested that this group may place value on having savings (TDAmeritrade, 2012 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104). Amárach Research (n.d., p.2) suggest that this cohort are “more conservative” in relation to finances. It is also suggested that this cohort, moreso than others, show the most focus on attaining personal feats (Barna Group, 2018 cited in Schroth, 2019, p.5). Generation Z has been suggested to be “diverse” (Fry and Parker, 2018, p.3), to the greatest degree to date, in terms of race and ethnicity, compared with alternative generations (Fry and Parker, 2018). Although many Millennials have acquired education to degree-level and have incurred financial borrowings as a result, it is suggested that Millennials who are employed today earn an equal amount of money to their counterparts in 1989 who didn’t earn a “degree” (Mondres, 2019, p.26). In contrast, Generation Z is more adverse to the concept of amassing financial borrowings (Mondres, 2019).

Lanier (2017) suggests that these individuals have an inclination towards applications (apps) which allow users more privacy than do others e.g., Snapchat which is “impermanent” (p.289). Generation Z is also proposed to anticipate people from a range of varying environments in their place of employment (Lanier, 2017). They have been connected to individuals from varying environments on social media throughout their lives (Lanier, 2017). Van den Bergh and Behrer (2016 cited in Priporas, Stylos and Fotiadis, 2017, p.376) suggest that Generation Z utilise technology on a significant basis and view technology as akin to a tool or device for them to utilise. Hillier (2019) suggests that it was found in Third Sector’s ‘Donating Trends’ research that less of those individuals aged between sixteen and twenty-four are making monetary donations to charitable organisations in contrast to findings in the preceding two years. Interestingly and in contrast, it is this cohort that has the highest probability of engaging in voluntary work (Hillier, 2019).

Francis and Hoefel, in association with McKinsey & Company, (2018) conducted research on Generation Z in Brazil and suggest that while there were a quartet of key behaviours that emerged in the study in relation to this cohort, “all anchored in one element: this generation’s search for truth” (Francis and Hoefel, 2018, p.2). This research refers to Generation Z as “identity nomads” (Francis and Hoefel, 2018, p.4) given that they are found to not want to settle on an identity but rather would like to try out alternative forms of identity and form
same over a duration (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). This report also refers to Generation Z as “radically inclusive” (Francis and Hoefel, 2018, p.5), given that they consider that their relationships with connections online and in real life are of equal measure (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). They place worth on networks built online as they do not discriminate between individuals’ demographics in relation to money, but rather permit those of similar movements or with common curiosities to gravitate together (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). They are also tolerant when organisations do not perform in the way that they would ideally expect (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). This generation is suggested to be “realistic” (Francis and Hoefel, 2018, p.6). It is suggested that sixty-five per cent of the cohort place worth on having information about what is taking place in their vicinity and also place worth on “being in control” (Francis and Hoefel, 2018, p.6). Again, the sample place more significance on having employment security as opposed to earning elevated wages (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). Seven out of ten respondents report that it is from organisations that they see as having an ethical stance that they endeavour to buy commodities from (Francis and Hoefel, 2018). Regarding organisations who have been associated with wrongdoings, approximately eight out of ten of the sample will not consider purchasing commodities from same (Francis and Hoefel, 2018).

2.5.1.1 Generation Z compared globally with other generations

Nielsen (2015) conducted an online survey with thirty thousand participants from approximately sixty distinctive nations. This study is named ‘Global Generational Lifestyles’ (Nielsen, 2015).

2.5.1.1.1 Eating habits

This study’s findings revealed that Baby Boomers were most likely to acknowledge to utilising technological devices when they are having their meals (Nielsen, 2015). Millennials were found to dine in establishments the most frequently, with almost one out of three dining in this way at least three times weekly (Nielsen, 2015). Whilst fifty-eight per cent of Millennials dine in this way once weekly at a minimum, the same can be said for just forty-six per cent of Generation Z, forty-four per cent of Generation X, and under thirty per cent of Baby Boomers and of the Silent Generation (Nielsen, 2015).
2.5.1.1.2 Leisure time

Regarding what they do in their leisure time, Generation Z’s top rated activities included “listening to music” (Nielsen, 2015, p.10), followed by reading, followed by watching TV. Among Millennials and Generation X, the two most popular activities were watching TV and socialising with family and/or friends, in that order (Nielsen, 2015). Reading was the top-rated activity among the Silent Generation, followed by watching TV (Nielsen, 2015).

2.5.1.1.3 Employment and Careers

The preferred discipline to work in differed across the generations, with Generation Z respondents showing preference for careers in “science, technology, engineering and math (STEM)”, Millennials and Generation X showing preference for careers in “Information Technology”, Baby Boomers showing a preference for careers in “Education & Training” and the Silent Generation showing preference for careers in “Health Science” (Nielsen, 2015, p.13).

2.5.1.1.4 Finances

When surveyed about saving, thirty-two per cent of Generation Z responded that they felt they put aside an adequate monetary amount each month and are self-assured about their forthcoming financial situation. The same was found for thirty-four per cent of Millennials, twenty-three per cent of Generation X, twenty-three per cent of Boomers and twenty-eight per cent of the Silent Generation (Nielsen, 2015). In contrast, twenty-one per cent of Generation Z do not put aside a monetary amount for their forthcoming financial situation, and the same was found for eighteen per cent of Millennials, twenty-seven per cent of Generation X, thirty-six per cent of Boomers and thirty-four per cent of the Silent Generation (Nielsen, 2015).

2.5.2 Generation Z: the future, issues of concern and government

UNiDAYS (2019) conducted research on almost seventeen thousand Generation Z participants from four different countries: the United Kingdom, the United States, New Zealand and Australia, and the findings of this research are presented in a report named ‘Gen Z: Preparing to Face the Future’ (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019). This cohort presented with differing sentiments regarding the view of the future, with just over thirty per cent having a positive
perspective regarding time to come, just over ten per cent having a negative perspective and with almost sixty per cent having a conflicted perspective about same (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019). In terms of their plans for the future, just over seventy per cent intend on marrying. Similarly, seventy per cent said they intend on pro-creating (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019). On the other hand, twenty-one per cent were uncertain about whether they intend to marry or procreate (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019). The top matters of concern among Generation Z were ranked in order of importance in the following order: “healthcare” (seventy-five per cent) (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019, p.4), expenses related to college (seventy-one per cent), the “environment” (seventy per cent) (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019, p.4), “equality” among individuals (seventy per cent) (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019, p.4), “jobs and employment” (sixty-five per cent) (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019, p.4), among other matters following those (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019). Excluding Generation Z participants from New Zealand, over half (fifty-four per cent) of the participants claimed “they don’t trust elected officials” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019, p.5). On the whole, over half (fifty-eight per cent) responded that governments are not advancing matters that are of significance and almost sixty-five per cent feel that they aren’t being listened to (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019, p.5). A majority of the participants are worried about gaining employment (70%), whilst a significant 85% fear not having enough money to pay for a residence (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019). Whilst the report relating to this study presented a limited number of findings in the context of the different geographical locations of the respondents, a clearer breakdown of each finding relating to Generation Z in the four different locations from which they were recruited would be of merit here. If additional findings relating to Generation Z in each of the four locations from which the respondents were from were presented, additional interesting observations may be evident in terms of how Generation Z vary based on their different geographical contexts.

2.5.3 Generation Z in Ireland

There is a limited amount of existing research focusing on Generation Z in Ireland. In 2019, The Young Social Innovators (YSI) and Amárach Research released three sets of findings in relation to their research (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, 2019b and 2019c). The following paragraphs will outline the
findings from this research. Current research focusing on participants aged between sixteen and twenty-one year olds in Ireland (n=458) suggests that Generation Z are experiencing stress (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a). When asked to select one word to depict their generation’s mood, approximately thirty-one per cent of the sample identified their generation’s mood as “stressed” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7). Sixteen per cent of the cohort who responded chose the word “enthusiastic” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7), fifteen per cent chose the word “anxious” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7), twelve per cent selected the word “depressed” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7), eleven per cent chose the word “motivated” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7) while six per cent chose the word “calm” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7). Other words selected included “lazy/unmotivated” (two per cent) (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7), “optimistic/hopeful” (one per cent) (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7), “lost” (one per cent) (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7), “open minded/accepting” (one per cent) (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7) and five per cent specified other words (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a). The sample of 458 participants was asked what the largest problems for the youth residing in Ireland were. Sixty-four percent of female respondents selected “Depression or Anxiety” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.9), with just fifty per cent of male respondents saying this. The second most selected issue was stress related to school or examinations, with forty-eight per cent of males selecting this and sixty per cent of females doing so. The problem that came the third highest among the other issues was “fear or anxiety about the future” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.9). “Drugs or alcohol” related problems were next in line with forty-eight per cent of males and females choosing this (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.9). “Climate change” was fifth with thirty-eight per cent of males and fifty-two per cent of females choosing this (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.9). Several other issues followed such as “Housing”, “Being different”, “Sex education”, “Cyber bullying”, “Consent” and so on (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.9). The respondents were also asked what issues they feel that they would work on themselves to try to ameliorate. Among males and females, this research found that the respondents saw themselves as most likely to work on trying to ameliorate “climate change” (YSI
and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.11). Second, came “Depression or Anxiety”, third was “school or exam stress”, fourth was “Being different (diversity)”, and fifth was “Consent” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.11). It also found that just under eighty per cent of this group feel that their parents hear and attend to what they say, but just twelve per cent feel that those operating in government or politics are heeding their voices (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a). Almost forty-five per cent of these respondents believe that brands are paying heed to what they are saying (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a). When asked what they think would represent a fruitful life for them in the future, thirty-nine per cent identified making an impact or change globally or in their society as the strongest representation of a prosperous life, with having stability financially coming second in line with twenty per cent of respondents identifying this as being most representative of a prosperous life (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a). Having a healthy mentality and being content was identified as the most representative of a fruitful life by just five per cent of the respondents, while only one per cent identified having a loving spouse and having positive connections as being the most representative of prosperity (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a).

In July 2019, YSI and Amárach Research released part two of their research on Generation Z in Ireland (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). This second release concentrated on Generation Z’s “smartphone usage and Gen Z’s attitudes to social media” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b, p.2). Firstly, this research investigated how much time Generation Z in Ireland use their smartphones for, on a daily basis. Four hours was the mean quantity of time which these respondents used their smartphones for each day (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). Approximately twenty-one per cent of participants who responded to this question (aged between 16 and 21 years old) reported spending at least six hours per day on their phones, with fourteen per cent reporting that they spend approximately five hours on their phones each day (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). Just three per cent of respondents reported spending an hour or less than an hour per day on their phones (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). In relation to social media, six out of ten respondents reported that social media has played a beneficial role for them (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). In contrast however, the majority of respondents (ninety-three per cent) reported feeling that the experience of being a teenager in 2019 was harder than
being a teenager had been “for their parents” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b, p.9). The top three reasons reported for feeling like this were, firstly that these respondents felt under strain to achieve academically and to get a third level education so that they would be able to attain employment (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). Secondly, these respondents reported feeling that via social media, they are exposed to levels of aesthetics and life fulfilment that are not attainable in real life (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). Finally, the findings suggest that a substantial percentage of respondents (twenty-eight per cent) felt that they were continually being observed by others via social media and felt “peer pressure” emanating from social media (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b, p.13).

The third part of the YSI and Amárach Research was released in November 2019 (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019c). This report outlined a number of findings in relation to sixteen to twenty-one year old respondents in Ireland whom were surveyed either in person and online. In relation to employment, it is proposed that while being employed with a public body or being self-employed operating their own enterprise are the preferred employment options for this cohort, there were differences based on gender (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019c). First, while thirty-one per cent of females surveyed would put preference on working on the public sector, just twenty-two per cent of females surveyed want to be self-employed operating their own enterprise (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019c). In contrast, just sixteen per cent of males surveyed want to work with a public body, while thirty-seven per cent of the males surveyed want to be self-employed and operate their own enterprise (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019c). In relation to higher education, a vast majority (eighty-three per cent) feel that the significance put on higher education is excessive (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019c). While nine out of ten females plan to attend college, the same can be said for just over seven out of ten males, however males have a much higher likelihood of wishing to undertake an apprenticeship (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019c). Close to six out of ten respondents surveyed think that they will be employed or reside outside of Ireland in time to come (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019c). Finally, in terms of what Generation Z consider important for organisations to have, giving just pay to employees was among the top three most important aspects, and was
considered the most important, followed by incorporating sustainability into products and contributing to tackling “climate change” (YSI and Amárcach Research, 2019c, p.23). Providing backing for positive movements internationally came third in line (YSI and Amárcach Research, 2019c).

### 2.5.4 Generation Z at work

Generation Z are graduating into adulthood. They are also suggested to be gaining work (Randstad, 2016). Thus, it was considered useful to look at the literature in relation to Generation Z and work. While the following findings are related to Generation Z and work, these findings were deemed of interest given that such findings may carry over into the context of Generation Z’s leisure time. The following paragraphs will outline the existing literature in relation to Generation Z and work.

Meret et al. (2018?) conducted a survey with a sample of over three hundred and twenty respondents who were between sixteen and twenty-six years old, in Italy, where it was disseminated in Italian and in alternative nations, where it was disseminated in English (Meret et al., 2018?). The survey collected demographic information, as well as queried what Generation Z anticipate in relation to their future optimal employment, and finally, explored the behaviour of Generation Z in relation to technology in order to gauge how they will behave in time to come when they are in work settings. Close to three hundred responses were analysed from the total dataset (Meret et al., 2018?). The findings revealed that most respondents planned to complete a Master’s qualification, and a goal of the majority was to work in a global organisation (Meret et al., 2018?). This study found that just twelve per cent of respondents in this survey said that they intended to undertake endeavours associated with entrepreneurship (Meret et al., 2018?). This is in opposition to any previous research that suggests that this cohort are enterprising (Meret et al., 2018?). This sample was asked what the most important features of the job to be considered would be, in relation to their first employment (Meret et al., 2018?). Three out of four respondents indicated that learning and development would be an important element of their employment, with “trust” (Meret et al., 2018, n.p) coming next and having “security” (Meret et al., 2018, n.p) in their employment following as the most
Iorgulescu (2016) examined the perceptions of Generation Z university students in Romania with regards to their future working careers. Over one hundred and fifty students completed a survey in April 2016. The majority of survey respondents were female and the author acknowledges that the findings are not generalisable to the wider population of the Generation Z cohort in the country of Romania. The extent of the generalisability of the findings does present a limitation with regards to Iorgulescu’s (2016) study. However, the findings are still noted to be insightful. Almost forty-five per cent said that their optimal place of employment would be a “large international corporation” (Iorgulescu, 2016, p.50); whilst just under twenty per cent said that their optimal place of employment would be a “midsize company” (Iorgulescu, 2016, p.50). Just under twenty per cent said they would be prepared to “work in a start-up or in an entrepreneurial initiative” (Iorgulescu, 2016, p.50); the same could be said for just over five per cent in relation to an NGO (Iorgulescu, 2016). Just under twelve per cent would be prepared to work for themselves as contractors or on a consultancy basis (Iorgulescu, 2016). This is similar to findings from Meret et al., (2018) in relation to the entrepreneurial inclinations of Generation Z. Over forty-seven per cent would rather work “in an open-space office” (Iorgulescu, 2016, p.50) amongst a sizeable team whilst less than thirty-five per cent would have a preference for working by themselves in an office that they do not share (Iorgulescu, 2016). Less popular settings included the option of working in an environment with a closed door and with a less sizeable team (just over ten per cent had a preference for this) whilst just less than eight per cent said they wanted to work on their own remotely (Iorgulescu, 2016). In terms of what this sample consider most important when selecting employment, the top three matters of importance were firstly the opportunity for promotion (over eighty-seven per cent selected this as a top matter of importance), receiving good wages for work undertaken (over sixty per cent selected this as a top matter of importance) and thirdly, the level of “security” (Iorgulescu, 2016, p.50) associated with the post (almost forty four per cent selected this as a top matter of importance) (Iorgulescu, 2016). It was found when asking these same respondents what their expected wages would be after they complete their college education, that although there were varied answers, their answers overall
were suggested to be reasonable, when taking the mean amount received for work completed at the time in Romania into account and comparing them (Iorgulescu, 2016). Interestingly, the vast majority of the sample (almost eighty-five per cent) said they believe they will need to work much harder than preceding generations in order to be prosperous in their careers (Iorgulescu, 2016).

Fratričová and Kirchmayer (2018) investigated Generation Z and the barriers to their motivation in their place of employment, using a sample of over two hundred and thirty students in Slovakia who were born between the years of 1995 and 1998 and whose selected topic of study was management. Eighty-five per cent of the sample had engaged in employment or an internship at some stage. This research utilised “method of empathy-based stories (MEBS)” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.31) for gathering data. This involved asking Generation Z to read a positive excerpt and a negative excerpt about an employee’s motivation and participation in his employment (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). The sample was required to give explanations for why they thought the scenario in the excerpt was occurring and seven hundred and thirty suggestions emerged from the data initially (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). Taking just the explanations suggested for Samuel’s negative feelings, over fifty-seven per cent of the respondents suggested that Samuel, the character in the excerpt, did not get enjoyment from the work and this could be the explanation for his negative feelings (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). The other prevalent reason for Samuel’s negative feelings in relation to work, suggested by almost half of this sample, was the atmosphere of the team (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). Over twenty-one per cent of the sample attributed Samuel’s negative feelings to having excessive work to do (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). Twenty per cent of the sample suggested that Samuel didn’t feel a “sense of purpose” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.31) in his employment and this was the reason for his negative feelings. “Low pay” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.32) was ascribed to by almost eighteen per cent of participants, while a separate factor, unjust wages, was ascribed to by almost ten per cent of participants (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). Other reasons alluded to were Samuel not being interested in his employment, that he didn’t achieve adequately at work, that his employment was not the type of work that appealed to him, not
having a positive connection with his leader or having a leader who was not good at leading, having work that was boring (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018), having poor “physical work conditions” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.32), having bad relationships with his colleagues, experiencing a lack of career progress, not feeling acknowledged for his work and additionally it was suggested that Samuel’s negative feelings emerged for reasons not related to his employment at all (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). Some other reasons also emerged, including not being allowed to exercise “autonomy” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.32), lack of contentment with “work time” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.32), experiencing below-average “teamwork” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.32) or experiencing “mobbing” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.32). In relation to Samuel himself, reasons given for his mood included that he was indolent, had a pessimistic viewpoint, or that he was experiencing a day that wasn’t going well (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). Lastly, reasons regarding the place of employment were given including that the employer may not have had a good standing or if the place of employment was not a “good employer” (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018, p.32), the reasons for this were seen as possibly causing Samuel’s negative feelings (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). This study allowed the sample to come up with explanations for an employee’s feelings of negativity without giving them explanations to pick from or directing them in any way (Fratričová and Kirchmayer, 2018). This research provides insight into what this sample of Generation Z students consider to be the causes of negative feelings relating to work for the character featuring in the empathy-based stories, namely Samuel.

Dolot (2018) carried out a study with 1,162 respondents in association with an organisation in Poland, namely Grupa ATERIMA, who engage in sourcing staff. The sample in this study responded to a questionnaire. Participants (those born in and after the year 1990) of the study were required to select the traits and statements listed within the questionnaire that they felt were relatable. The findings of this research suggest that the item with which most participants related was the desire for a reaction from those who gave them jobs to complete (Dolot, 2018). Seventy-two per cent of the sample related to this characteristic (Dolot, 2018). Fifty-six per cent of the respondents agreed that they enjoy gaining knowledge about, and making use of, novel technological
advances (Dolot, 2018). Fifty-six per cent of the respondents would travel abroad for a brief period for reasons associated with their work but less than three out of ten would move residency less than or more than 100km on a long-term basis for employment reasons (Dolot, 2018). Just twenty-three per cent of the overall sample are thinking about relocating to a foreign country on a long-term basis (Dolot, 2018). Over half of the respondents related to using a calendar as a tool when engaging in making plans and findings suggested that over half of the cohort report having the ability to concentrate on their undertakings until they are complete (Dolot, 2018). Four out of ten respondents said they worry about looking for work and their employment in general (Dolot, 2018). Just under forty per cent of the respondents agreed that they would remain employed by the same company for their whole career “if a job were attractive” (Dolot, 2018, p.48). Facebook is suggested in this study to be the most popular social media channel among this age-group (Dolot, 2018). In addition, an analysis took place which investigated the results of the data from those participants born between the years of 1990 and 1995, while a separate analysis was carried out to investigate the results of the data emerging from those participants born after the year 1995 (Dolot, 2018). It is noted that the difference between the two groups of participants were small, however those born after 1995, for example, were found to be more open to relocating to another country on a more long-term basis (Dolot, 2018). They were also found to worry more about looking for work and about their employment in general and are more enthusiastic about engaging in teamwork as opposed to completing work alone (Dolot, 2018). This group related more to enjoying gaining knowledge about and the ability to obtain the use of novel technology (Dolot, 2018). In contrast, the findings from respondents born between the years of 1990 and 1995 suggested that this group related more to the desire to receive a reaction from those who gave them jobs to complete, than did the younger group of participants (Dolot, 2018). Those participants born between the years of 1990 and 1995 also related more to the questionnaire item relating to using a calendar as a tool when engaging in making plans and the questionnaire item relating to having the ability to concentrate on undertakings until they are complete (Dolot, 2018). It is noted that the results of this research are not generalisable because of the nature of the sample (Dolot, 2018). This presents a limitation in relation to Dolot’s (2018) research. It can be noted that
InsideOut Development (n.d. cited in Communication Briefings, 2019, n.p.) also carried out survey research with 1,000 participants, who were aged between 18 and 23 years old and this research also found that this generation desire feedback which is practical and useful, and they also like to be cheered on (InsideOut Development, n.d. cited in Communication Briefings, 2019, n.p.). In a similar way, Chicca and Shellenbarger (2019) suggested that Generation Z nurses wish to receive “frequent feedback” (p.48) in their paper ‘A new generation of nurses is here - Strategies for working with Generation Z.’

2.5.5 Generation Z and reading

In segment two of what Vercelletto (2019, p.26) terms the “Generational Reading Survey” by Library Journal, it was found that the same level of readers exist among Generation Z as in other generations previous to them. Over four hundred respondents aged between sixteen and twenty-two years old responded to a survey which provided the data described in this paper (Vercelletto, 2019). Over seven in ten reported having read a book, which could be in in any structure, in the previous year for enjoyment purposes (Vercelletto, 2019). This was what prospective participants had to have achieved in order to be able to participate (Vercelletto, 2019). In terms of hearing about new books to read, most of the respondents reported that they hear about new books from their close relations, namely family and friends. Social media was found to be the second source from which Generation Z hear about new books to read (Vercelletto, 2019). This research found that in terms of libraries, although Generation Z attend libraries with the same frequency as alternative generations, they do not get as many books on loan from the library as do alternative generations (Vercelletto, 2019). Amazon was the location from which two out of three of the respondents purchased books (Vercelletto, 2019). However, in terms of sourcing books overall, this sample reported to purchase books, get loans of books from libraries or close connections such as family or friends, get books as presents and read books online without being charged (Vercelletto, 2019). In terms of the ratio of fiction and non-fiction books read by this sample, it was approximated that about sixty-five per cent related to the former and about thirty-five per cent to the latter (Vercelletto, 2019). It was found that this cohort still have a desire to read physical books as opposed to reading books in digital form (Vercelletto, 2019). It
was also found that this generation are cost conscious (Vercelletto, 2019). While the content of the book is the first factor that influences this cohort’s decision to purchase a book, the price is the second factor (Vercelletto, 2019). It is suggested by this author that this cohort’s “price sensitivity” (Vercelletto, 2019, p.28) is greater “than that of “Depression babies”, the notoriously frugal members of the Silent Generation” (Vercelletto, 2019, p.28). Over half said that they get a loan of a specific book from the library instead of buying it, when that same book costs too much to purchase (Vercelletto, 2019).

2.5.6 Generation Z in America
A myriad of studies have been conducted on samples of Generation Z in America. These will be outlined in the following sections.

2.5.6.1 ‘Undivided 2019 Gen Z Purpose Study’
Over 1,000 participants who were between fourteen and twenty-two in the United States took part in an online survey by Toluna. The findings of this are outlined in the Porter, Novelli/Cone 2019 Purpose Study, focusing on Generation Z, named ‘Undivided 2019 Gen Z Purpose Study’. This study proposes that almost ninety per cent of Generation Z believe their cohort have the ability to improve the world and it was found that eighty-three per cent of respondents think that they could have an impact individually on matters that are of significance to them. Eighty-seven per cent feel heartened on observing people of their own age asserting a position on matters, for example, “Greta Thunberg” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.5) or “Emma González” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.5) (Porter, Novelli/Cone 2019). Seventy-six per cent of respondents responded that they think that five years into the future, they will have made advancements on subjects of significance (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). The findings suggest that eighty-eight per cent of Generation Z are bothered about matters related to the environment and society (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Nine out of ten respondents are suggested to believe that corporations ought to act upon such matters (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). When deliberating over what one should purchase, it is suggested that seventy-two per cent of Generation Z scrutinise a company’s “Purpose” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.6), whereas when deliberating about where one should be employed, it is suggested that eighty-three per cent of Generation Z take this into account (Porter,
Novelli/Cone, 2019). These findings suggest that the “environment” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.7) is the top problem among a range of issues that Generation Z respondents wish for corporations to face and tackle (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). The issue of the environment is followed by “poverty and hunger” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.7), “human rights” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.7), “economic development” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.7), “health and disease” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.7) and finally “education” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.7). In terms of news items, Generation Z respondents were asked what issues in the news corporations ought to attempt to tackle. Ninety-one per cent of respondents believed that the development of jobs is an issue corporations should deal with, whilst other issues they felt corporations should deal with included equality among people of all races, “sexual harassment” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.8), “women’s equality” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.8), “climate change” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.8), “religious freedom and tolerance” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.8), “immigration” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.8), “gun control” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.8), “LGBTQ+ rights” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.8), and so forth, in that order (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Generation Z were also found to be willing to participate in tackling matters, for example, eighty-five per cent of Generation Z respondents are likely to share their optimistic view of a corporation who is engaging in positive actions (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). It is suggested that eighty-four per cent are likely to purchase a good that is advantageous in terms of society or the environment (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Similarly, eighty-four per cent are suggested to be likely to engage in education regarding what they can do to have an impact (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Eighty-three per cent reported that they would volunteer in association with “causes” that they are personally concerned about (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). The likelihood of Generation Z to research a corporation to check if they are having a positive or negative impact socially or environmentally has increased by eight per cent from 2017 to 2019 (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Just over ninety per cent of respondents suggested that social media facilitates them acquiring knowledge about and getting involved in matters that concern them (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Seventy-seven per cent believe that they have more knowledge “than their parents or guardians” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.12) about matters of
significance and credit social media for this (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Thirty-five per cent of Generation Z were found to be motivated to share content related to matters associated with society or the environment in the hopes that it would motivate those who would see it to show the matter concern also (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). In terms of gaining more knowledge about or getting involved in matters related to the environment or society, Generation Z respondents in 2019 are suggested to use Youtube most often (sixty-four per cent), followed by Instagram (sixty-three per cent) and then Facebook (sixty-one per cent). In 2017, their top three channels for this were Facebook (sixty-six per cent), then Instagram (fifty-one per cent) and then Youtube (fifty per cent), in that order (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019).

2.5.6.2 Generational contrasts on social and political perspectives

In the next study described, a comparison is made between Generation Z and subsequent generations. Pew Research Center conducted research investigating the social and political views across a number of generations (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). While these findings are related to social and political perspectives and are not directly linked to Generation Z in the context of festivals, they were considered of value to include in the current literature review, given that some of these perspectives may also have influence in the context of Generation Z’s leisure time. This paper compared the outlooks of Generation Z, Millennials, Generation X, Baby Boomers and the Silent Generation across a range of social and political issues, as well as comparing the views of generations of Republicans and Democrats on some of these issues. The findings of this paper emerged from two separate samples in America. The first sample comprised close to eleven thousand adults (18 years old and over 18 years old) and the second sample included nine hundred and twenty participants aged between thirteen and seventeen years old. On some issues there was a general consensus of agreement among generations. For example, most agreed that people from different countries who had legally immigrated into America had had a beneficial impact socially, on the whole (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). In a similar way, most participants within each of the generations agreed that having increasing numbers of female candidates running in political elections was beneficial (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). What was evident on
this topic were “gender gaps” (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019, p.14). On the other hand, there were stark differences in the views of different generations on other issues. Of the five generations included in this research, the younger generations (Generation Z and Millennials) were inclined to have less conservative perspectives than those generations who were born earlier (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019).

2.5.6.2.1 Environmental issues
For example, in relation to “climate change” (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019, p.7), approximately five out of ten members of Generation Z (fifty-four per cent), five out of ten Millennials (fifty-six per cent) and almost five out of ten of Generation X (forty-eight per cent) think that climate change is a result of the actions of people (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). On the other hand, Baby Boomers (forty-five per cent) and the Silent Generation (thirty-eight) are less likely to place the blame for global warming on humans’ actions and are more likely than the younger generations to say that the cause of global warming is natural (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). In this case, the percentage of the Silent Generation who said that the cause of climate change is natural was twenty-eight per cent, followed by twenty-five per cent of Baby Boomers, as compared to twenty-one per cent of Generation X, sixteen per cent of Millennials and fourteen per cent of Generation Z (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019).

2.5.6.2.2 Government action
Younger generations were more likely to have a preference for the government undertaking action to resolve issues whereas older generations had a higher probability of saying that the government is undertaking actions that ought to be dealt with by business organisations and people (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). Seventy per cent of Generation Z showed a preference for the government undertaking actions of this kind, followed by sixty-four per cent of Millennials, in comparison to fifty-three per cent of Generation X, forty-nine per cent of Baby Boomers and thirty-nine per cent of the Silent Generation who shared this preference (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019).
2.5.6.2.3 Equality in terms of race

In terms of equality, it was found that the younger generations of participants had a higher likelihood of saying that blacks were not treated equally to whites, with sixty-six per cent of Generation Z and sixty-two per cent of Millennials saying this, compared to fifty-three per cent of Generation X, forty-nine per cent of Baby Boomers and forty-four per cent of the Silent Generation holding this opinion (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019).

2.5.6.2.4 Same-sex marriage

Regarding same-sex marriage there are also variations in the perspectives of the different generations. The majority of the younger generations viewed same-sex marriage from a positive perspective as opposed to a negative perspective. For example, almost fifty per cent of Generation Z viewed same-sex marriage as a positive entity, thirty-six per cent held the opinion that it “[d]oesn’t make a difference” (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019, p.11) and just fifteen per cent responded that they saw it in a negative light (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). Similarly, forty-seven per cent of Millennials viewed same-sex marriage in a positive light, thirty-seven per cent didn’t view it as something that is impactful and again just fifteen per cent held the view that it is negative. In contrast, thirty-three per cent of Generation X viewed same-sex marriage as a positive entity, forty-one per cent of Generation X didn’t view same-sex marriage as something that has an impact and twenty-five per cent viewed it as a negative entity (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). Twenty-seven per cent of Baby Boomers reported viewing same-sex marriage in a positive way, forty per cent reported that they didn’t view it as having any impact and thirty-two per cent saw it as negative. With regards to the Silent Generation, eighteen per cent saw same-sex marriage in a positive light, thirty-eight per cent held the opinion that it doesn’t have an impact and forty-three per cent responded that it is negative (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019).

2.5.6.2.5 Supplementary options in terms of gender pronouns

When asked about gender choices and whether administrative forms or “online profiles” (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019, p.14) should include supplementary options in addition to “man” and “woman” (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019,
p.14), the younger generations again had a higher probability of saying that supplementary choices should be incorporated for those for whom neither gender choice is appropriate as they identify as neither male nor female. Fifty-nine per cent of Generation Z said this, followed by fifty per cent of Millennials, approximately forty per cent of Generation X, thirty-seven per cent of Baby Boomers and thirty-two per cent of the Silent Generation (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019).

2.5.6.2.6 Differences by political party inclination and by generation
It was found that there were differences by party inclination in relation to the aforementioned point, with forty-one per cent of Generation Z who identified as Republican or who gravitated towards the Republican political party, saying that “forms” (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019, p.14) ought to incorporate supplementary choices in addition to “man” and “woman”, compared to seventy-one per cent of Generation Z who identify as Democrats or who gravitated towards the Democratic political party (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). This research also found that those from Generation Z who identified as Republican or who were inclined towards the Republican political party had a higher likelihood of saying that black citizens weren’t treated in an equal way to white citizens and of saying that greater diversity in terms of ethnicity and race in America was beneficial socially, in comparison to older generations of Republicans (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). In addition, Generation Z who identified as Republican or who gravitated towards the Republican political party, had a greater probability of saying that the government should increase the amount of work they undertake in order to try to find solutions to issues of concern, and have a lower probability of saying that the cause of global warming is natural, as opposed to the actions of people, than older generations of Republicans (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019).

2.5.6.3 Stress
Stress is suggested to be an issue faced by Generation Z in the United States for a number of reasons (American Psychological Association (APA), 2018). This finding that Generation Z in America experience stress is in alignment with that of The Young Social Innovators and Amárach Research (2019a), in relation to
the finding that Generation Z in Ireland describe their generation as “stressed” (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, p.7), as mentioned above. In 2018, a survey was disseminated for APA by The Harris Poll to almost three-and-a-half thousand adults aged eighteen years old or above eighteen years old, and in addition, three hundred fifteen to seventeen year olds in the United States participated in interviews. APA’s (2018) report shows findings relating to their interpretation of Generation Z in America, those aged between fifteen and twenty-one years old at the time of this research. For the purposes of this research, “Gen Z adults” (APA, 2018, p.2) refers to just the sample of Generation Z aged between eighteen and twenty-one years old, while “Gen Z teens” (APA, 2018, p.2) refers to just those members of Generation Z who were aged between fifteen years old and seventeen years old in this research.

2.5.6.3.1 Stress: Generation Z in comparison to other generations
Firstly, regarding stress levels, Millennials were found to be the most stressed generation in this research, with their mean levels of stress being set at 5.7, on a scale of one to ten. Generation Z followed, with an overall mean stress level of 5.3. Generation X’s mean level of stress was lower, at 5.1, Baby Boomers, 4.1 and the older adults in this research collectively were found to have a mean stress level of 3.3. In terms of stressors, “mass shootings” (APA, 2018, p.2), were a stressor for three quarters of Generation Z, with falling percentages of people in subsequent generations reporting “mass shootings” (APA, 2018, p.2) as significant causes of stress (Millennials: sixty-nine per cent; Generation X: fifty-eight per cent; Baby Boomers: fifty-eight per cent; Older adults (aged seventy-three or above seventy-three at the time of the research): forty-eight per cent) (APA, 2018). Fifteen to twenty-one year olds reported having a similar level of stress as others about the existing circumstances of their country at the time, at 5.4, with the mean level of stress about the state of the country reported by adults in general being 5.3 (APA, 2018). While a mean of approximately seventy per cent of adults overall planned on voting at the US midterm elections, just fifty-four per cent of the Generation Z adults (those aged between eighteen and twenty-one years old) in the sample planned on voting at the same forthcoming elections at the time. It is suggested by this report’s findings that Generation Z experience greater levels of stress than adults in general about topics featuring on
the news, such as “mass shootings” (APA, 2018, p.3), an increase in frequencies of suicide, environmental issues, namely “[c]limate change and global warming” (APA, 2018, p.3), issues faced by families not originally from the United States, namely deportation and the splitting-up of these families, and finally prevalent allegations of sexual violence and persecution (APA, 2018). When comparing Generation Z adults in this survey (eighteen to twenty-one year olds) with adults in general, it is suggested that eighty-one per cent of Generation Z adults are stressed by money versus sixty-four per cent of adults in general, while seventy-seven per cent of Generation Z adults are stressed by work, compared with sixty-four per cent of adults in general. Generation Z adults are more stressed about issues related to health than are adults in general (seventy-five per cent versus sixty-three per cent) but are less stressed than adults in general about the economic climate (forty-six per cent versus forty-eight per cent) (APA, 2018).

There is a higher probability that Generation Z of colour will acknowledge being stressed about private borrowings, unpredictability in relation to accommodation as well as concerns relating to having adequate food, when compared to white Generation Z (APA, 2018). Certain drugs are considered to be acting as stressors for members of Generation Z in this sample, with almost four out of ten reporting that the prevalent problems relating to opioids and heroin are a dominating stressor. When compared with adults in general, the results were comparable (APA, 2018). Fifty per cent of those from Generation Z in this research are familiar with an individual who has been advised that they have difficulties relating to, or have an addiction to, substances, namely alcohol or drugs (APA, 2018). Less than one in ten of Generation Z in this sample reported that they have been advised that they have difficulties relating to, or have an addiction to, substances, namely alcohol or drugs (APA, 2018). In terms of seeking help for themselves, twenty-five per cent reported not being aware of where they would seek assistance for difficulties or addictions relating to drugs or alcohol, and a greater percentage again (thirty-five per cent) stated that they wouldn’t be aware of where to seek assistance for friends or family who needed help with such issues (APA, 2018). In this research, seventy-three per cent of Generation Z stated that they believed that over the last twelve months, they would have benefitted from additional “emotional support” (APA, 2018, p.6). While over half said that social media “provides a feeling of support” (APA, 2018, p.6),
forty-five per cent of this generation said they feel that they are being evaluated because of social media, and thirty-eight per cent of this group said that their engagement with social media makes them have negative thoughts in relation to themselves (APA, 2018).

2.5.6.3.2 Mental Health

In terms of mental health, Generation Z in this study were the generation with the highest percentage (twenty-seven) reporting that their mental health could be classified as “fair” or “poor” (APA, 2018, p.4), compared to their older counterparts. Fifteen per cent of Millennials reported this, with thirteen per cent of Generation X, seven per cent of Baby Boomers and five per cent of those aged over seventy-two years old the sample saying the same (APA, 2018). While twenty-seven per cent of Generation Z in this research reported that their mental health was “fair or poor” (APA, 2018, p.4), this was broken down by gender and it was found that thirty-five per cent of females reported this, in comparison to eighteen per cent of males from this generation (APA, 2018). Thirty-six per cent of females from Generation Z and thirty-eight per cent of males from this generation reported having obtained or that they were obtaining “treatment or therapy” (APA, 2018, p.4) for their mental health issues from someone who is a “psychologist or other mental health professional” (APA, 2018, p.4). This is compared with Millennials (thirty-five per cent), Generation X (twenty-six per cent), Baby Boomers (twenty-two per cent) or the eldest group in the sample (fifteen per cent) who have obtained or are obtaining “help” (APA, 2018, p.4) from a qualified person in the mental health sector or from a psychologist, for their mental health difficulties (APA, 2018).

2.5.7 Generation Z and education

Barnes and Noble College conducted research on a sample of one thousand three hundred participants aged from thirteen to eighteen in the United States, which focused on Generation Z in high school and middle school and what they anticipate regarding third-level education (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). In this research, almost nine out of ten respondents placed value on attaining a third-level education (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). Attaining a respectable position in employment post-college is this sample’s greatest worry
relating to third-level education (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). With regards to the future, just over eight out of ten students intend on going from high school straight to third-level education (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). Just under four out of ten are contemplating enrolling in a community college and a “tech or trade school” (Barnes and Noble College, n.d., p.4) appeals to just over two out of ten participants in this research (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). Just under fifty per cent of those aged between sixteen and eighteen years old have taken a course that will act as a credit during their third-level education in advance of going to third-level, with almost eighty-five per cent of those aged between thirteen and fifteen intending to do so also (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). It is suggested that despite the challenge associated with these classes in comparison to their standard curricula, it is suggested that sixty-four per cent of pupils enjoy these classes the same amount or more than their standard curricula (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). In terms of employment, four out of ten of this sample of Generation Z want an occupation that will match their curiosities and thirty-five per cent of Generation Z already own an enterprise or intend on doing so in time to come (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). It is suggested that those individuals between thirteen and fifteen years old in this research have double the probability of owning an enterprise on the Internet than have those individuals between sixteen and eighteen years old in this research (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). In terms of learning inclinations, Generation Z in this research show a partiality for learning practically, with fifty-one per cent saying they like to learn by practicing or doing, thirty-eight per cent saying their most optimal method of learning is visually and twelve per cent saying their most optimal method of learning is audibly (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.).

Puiu (2017) explored Generation Z’s perspectives in relation to education and management. This research was conducted via an online survey in 2016 with a sample of one hundred and eleven participants born between the years of 1990 and 2000, in Romania. In terms of education, almost ninety-five per cent of the participants in this sample showed a preference for learning by themselves as opposed to learning in the presence of their associates (Puiu, 2017). Just under sixty-seven per cent reported that they learn by undertaking hands-on activities, while “reading” (Puiu, 2017, p.66) was the chosen method of learning for 27% of participants. This study revealed that “listening” (Puiu, 2017, p.66) was the
chosen method of learning for just over six per cent of the sample (Puiu, 2017). In terms of management, this sample were asked to select not more than three traits of managers that they believe are required in order to be perceived as amiable (Puiu, 2017). In this case, the findings suggest that the top three qualities that managers should have in order to be liked, in the view of this sample of Generation Z, were “intelligence” (just under sixty per cent) (Puiu, 2017, p.70), “integrity and honesty” (just over fifty-five per cent) (Puiu, 2017, p.70) and the capacity to act as a role model and guide for his or her supervisees (just over forty-three per cent) (Puiu, 2017). There is a limitation in association with the inclusion of findings from Puiu’s (2017) study in the current study. Respondents of Puiu’s (2017) study were born between the years of 1990 and 2000. In the current study, Generation Z is taken to be those who were born between the years of 1995 and 2009 (e.g., Goh and Lee, 2018). Therefore, only a fraction of the respondents in Puiu’s (2017) study would be considered to be Generation Z, by the current study’s standards. The findings were nonetheless considered insightful and were retained within the literature review for this reason.

O’Connor (2020, n.p.) discusses “Active consent” (O’Connor, 2020, n.p.) which is an initiative regarding “informed sexual consent and an individual’s role and responsibility in one of life’s most intimate acts”. O’Connor suggested that TU Dublin now incorporates this initiative into their “orientation” (O’Connor, 2020, n.p.) for new “students” (O’Connor, 2020, n.p.), in which two thousand “students” (O’Connor, 2020, n.p.) have got involved and over eight in ten would advocate to a peer (O’Connor, 2020). As discussed by other researchers, O’Connor acknowledges that the cohort of Generation Z were starting their teenage years when the recession occurred and their parents (Generation X) would have been impacted by this economically. What this group experienced has influenced their perceptions and behaviours (O’Connor, 2020). They place more value on being stable financially than being rich (O’Connor, 2020). O’Connor (2020, n.p.) suggests that Generation Z are a cohort of rationalists and that they “yearn for expert stewardship and life curators who can sift, distil and quiet the noise of the reams of knowledge at the fingertips”.
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2.5.8 Generation Z as consumers

Priporas, Stylos and Fotiadis (2017) conducted research with Generation Z by interviewing students in university in the United Kingdom. The research explored these buyers’ views, anticipations and suggestions regarding their prospective engagement with smart retailing (Priporas, Stylos and Fotiadis, 2017). Findings suggested most of the participants who participated in the research shopped using their smartphone, whilst four of the thirty-eight participants showed preference for shopping on their computer but browsed using their smartphones (Priporas, Stylos and Fotiadis, 2017). This was for “safety reasons” (Priporas, Stylos and Fotiadis, 2017, p.377).

A UNiDAYS (2018) report suggests that in comparison with Millennials, with an attention span lasting twelve seconds in duration, that Generation Z has an attention span which is four seconds shorter (UNiDAYS, 2018). UNiDAYS disseminated a survey among 1,800 plus students within the Generation Z cohort in June, 2018. The sample were located in four different areas: New Zealand, the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. This survey suggests that eight out of ten of the sample responded that their reason for attending college was to earn a greater amount of money (UNiDAYS, 2018). It is suggested that over seven in ten of the pupils at undergraduate level are doing work that enables them to earn some extra money. In terms of credit, it was found that over eight out of ten of this sample endeavour to save money before buying something significant, as opposed to relying on credit to buying the significant item (UNiDAYS, 2018). It is acknowledged that this may be down to the fact that less than half the sample has access to credit (UNiDAYS, 2018). Over seven out of ten of the sample have an account for deposits or savings which they would have established while in second level education (UNiDAYS, 2018). In terms of banking, over five out of ten responded that they would think about banking with a bank that operates on the Internet only (UNiDAYS, 2018). Over four out of ten wouldn’t be willing to do this, and for seven out of ten of those who wouldn’t bank with a bank that operates only on the Internet, the reason is that they would like to bank with a bank that has a material presence and place (UNiDAYS, 2018). This is noted as interesting given that Generation Z have not lived in a world where the Internet has not existed and as per UNiDAYS (2018) are referred to as a “digital native” generation (UNiDAYS, 2018, p.15). A
breakdown of each of the findings of the survey conducted by UNiDAYS (2018) related to Generation Z in each geographical zone within this report would have provided additional insight into Generation Z, as well as the differences that exist between Generation Z samples in varying contexts. This is one drawback of the UNiDAYS (2018) research findings presented within this report.

In Romania, Băltescu (2019) looked at Generation Z’s tourism consumption. Two hundred and twenty-eight survey responses were utilised. In terms of planning tourism activities, just under two in ten engage in tourism monthly, just under three in ten engage in tourism every quarter, whilst four out of ten do so on two occasions each year and just under one and a half in ten engage in tourism just one time annually (Băltescu, 2019). Three quarters of respondents indicated that they utilised the online resources, namely the Internet, to source data/knowledge and to make reservations related to their engagement in tourism. It was found that among this sample, the majority of respondents engage in tourism in Romania (Băltescu, 2019).

2.5.9 Generation Z and festivals in Hungary

In Hungary, Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti (2019) investigated Generation Z and their “customer satisfaction and experience” (Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019, p.253) regarding festivals and events related to tourism. It is suggested by these authors that traditional experiences in relation to tourism do not appeal to this group and that in the summertime, this group attend festivals or pursue experiences that are unusual. It is suggested that attending a festival in relation to music is an experience that members of Generation Y and Z perceive as a prerequisite. Studies related to this research area (music festivals and young people in Hungary) had been undertaken prior to Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti’s (2019) study. However, these studies are now considered outdated (e.g., Kovács, 2009a cited in Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019, p.254). For example, Kovács (2009a, cited in Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019, p.255) found that less than two out of ten Hungarian festival-goers who attended the festival named Sziget were aged twenty-nine years old or above, hence the majority of Hungarian attendees were relatively young (under twenty or in their twenties). In Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti’s (2019) study, a survey was responded to by Generation Z in 2018 which investigated overall tourism, tourism related to festivals and a number of
festivals that take place in the country of Hungary, namely “VOLT, Balaton Sound, EFOTT, Sziget and Strand” (Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019, p.256). Respondents were aged above 18 and less than 25 years old at the time of participation, residing in the country of Hungary and had visited a festival related to music in the same year (2018) (Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019). In relation to the dimensions of experience across all of the festivals, taking Pine and Gilmore’s 4 E’s, Entertainment was found to be of the greatest value in terms of satisfaction to the sample of Generation Z who participated (Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019). “[E]conomical value” (Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019, p.257) was second most important, but only for three of the five festivals investigated - those three are suggested to be the more expensive of the five (Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019). Escapism was also suggested to be of note (Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti, 2019). On visual inspection, it could be said to hold an approximately similar amount of importance across all five festivals.

2.5.10 Generation Z and digital experiences

As stated previously, the Internet has been in existence throughout the time since Generation Z have been born (Prensky, 2001, cited in Turner, 2015, p.104) and Generation Z have been immersed in a mobile world as they have grown up (Palley, 2012 cited in Turner, 2015, p.105). Generation Z have a greater reliance on technology (in terms of being online) than generations preceding them (WP Engine and The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017). Research has shown that there are dissimilarities between the perspectives of Generation Z and previous generations’ perspectives in relation to digital experiences. In relation to their first thought “when they think about a digital experience” (WP Engine and The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017, p.5), social media was the leading thought of almost ninety per cent of Generation Z, whereas an approximately similar volume of respondents of Baby Boomers and Generation X respectively said that email was their leading thought (WP Engine and The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017). It was also suggested that Generation Z are more selective about what experiences they share and with whom as well as on which social media platforms, unlike Millennials who were suggested to share content less selectively (WP Engine and The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017). Sixty-two per cent of Generation Z were found in this research to go on the
Internet for “entertainment” (WP Engine and The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017, p.7), whereas in contrast, fifty-two per cent of Baby Boomers, fifty-four per cent of Generation X and just under sixty per cent of Generation Y reported that they go online to get “information” (WP Engine and The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017, p.7).

Millennials (n=111) and Generation Z (n=53) were compared in terms of whether they owned smartphones, their utilisation of social media and whether an online method as a way of treating the use of substances by these cohorts would be accepted (Curtis et al., 2019). This research in the United States focused on treatments for substance use, however, the current study will just focus on its findings in relation to social media. It must be noted that one of the pre-requisites was that respondents had to be enlisted onto an “outpatient program” (Curtis et al., 2019, p.5) at the same time as the research survey was responded to, to qualify for participation in the survey associated with this research (Curtis et al., 2019). It was found that Millennials showed a preference for the use of Facebook whilst Generation Z within this research sample showed a preference for the use of Snapchat and Instagram (Curtis et al., 2019).

As per Skift (2020), “the visual-laden and bite-size-video-heavy platforms of Snapchat, YouTube and Instagram are capturing more of the screen time of the younger generation” (Skift, 2020, p.28). Meret et al. (2018?) conducted research as described previously. Findings in relation to the sample’s future optimal employment have been discussed in section 2.5.4. When responding in relation to social media use, less than three out of ten respondents interact with social media/networks for over 4 hours per day (Meret et al., 2018?). Thirty-six per cent report using social channels for two to four hours daily and precisely thirty-five per cent of respondents report engaging with social media channels for one to two hours daily (Meret et al., 2018). Eight out of ten respondents use social media channels in order to use facilities that allow users to send immediate messages associated with the given channels, and fourteen per cent of respondents use social media channels in order to telephone others (Meret et al., 2018?).

A Pew Research Center paper (Anderson and Jiang, 2018) suggested that eighty-five per cent of thirteen to seventeen year olds utilise Youtube, seventy-two per cent utilise Instagram, sixty-nine per cent utilise Snapchat and just over
half use Facebook (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). Formerly, Facebook was found to be more favoured among American teenagers with over seven out of ten respondents aged between thirteen and seventeen reportedly using it in previous research (Pew Research Center, 2015). This finding emerged in previous research presented by Pew Research Center in 2014-2015 (Pew Research Center, 2015). In the 2014-2015 research, the second most used social media channel was Instagram, with fifty-two per cent reportedly engaging with it, and just over forty per cent reportedly using Snapchat (Pew Research Center, 2015). In the 2018 research conducted by Pew Research Center, Snapchat was the social media channel that was reported to be used on the most frequent basis, with thirty-five per cent of respondents selecting this as the channel used most frequently by teenagers, followed by Youtube which was the channel chosen by thirty-two of respondents (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). Anderson and Jiang (2018) caution that there were some differences in the methodology in the 2018 research and 2014-2015 research (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). This should be kept in mind when considering the results of both studies. Similarly, the 2014-2015 research was based online, whereas the 2018 research was conducted online and via telephone (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). It’s suggested that “…previous research has found that the mode of interview — telephone vs. online self-administration — can affect the results” (Pew Research Center, 2015, p.3). In 2018, ninety-five per cent of these adolescents owned a smartphone or were able to acquire a smartphone (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). In the 2014-2015 research, the percentage who possessed a smartphone was markedly different at seventy-three per cent (Pew Research Center, 2015). Eighty-eight per cent of the teens in the 2018 research said they had a computerised device where they live which they could acquire, but the percentage varied based on household annual income and based on the educational attainments of their parents (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). Forty-five per cent of the sample of thirteen to seventeen year olds in 2018 reported that they are on the Internet close to all of the time (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). In 2014-2015, just less than one quarter of were reportedly on the Internet close to all of the time (Pew Research Center, 2015). The 2018 study revealed that in terms of devices for playing games, eighty-four per cent own or can acquire such a console in their residence (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). Less than half of adolescents disclosed that the impact of social media is neither
beneficial nor disadvantageous for people of their age, while just over three in ten report that social media is mostly beneficial for people of their age and just under a quarter report that it is mostly disadvantageous for people of their age (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). In this study, as discussed, Youtube, Instagram and Snapchat (in that order) were found to be the most popular social media sites used by those aged between thirteen and seventeen, with Facebook coming fourth in line (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). Despite Youtube being the channel used by the largest number of respondents, Snapchat was the social media channel reported to be used the most frequently by respondents (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). In the 2014-15 report, the four social media channels which were the most popular with that sample were Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat and Twitter, in that order (Pew Research Center, 2015). This shows how social media use has changed in the timeframe between these two reports (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). The 2018 research also found gender differences in social media use, with teenage girls showing a preference for Snapchat, indicating that they use this most frequently, whilst for boys, their most frequently used social media channel was Youtube (Anderson and Jiang, 2018). Taking Stock With Teens® is a survey that takes place twice each year and has done since the year 2001, and it was carried out by Piper Sandler in America in the season of spring, in the year 2020 (Piper Sandler, 2020). The fall report presented by Piper Jaffray (2019) found that among their sample in America (which had a mean of just under sixteen years of age in the United States), the most often visited social media channel was Instagram (eighty-five per cent), followed by Snapchat (eighty-one per cent) followed by Twitter (forty per cent). Facebook was less frequently visited (thirty-one per cent) as was Pinterest (twenty-five per cent) (Piper Jaffray, 2019). Statistics related to TikTok did not feature on this 2019 report. In spring 2020, Piper Sandler’s findings showed that Instagram is still the most often visited social media channel (eight-five per cent), this is followed by Snapchat (eighty-two per cent), TikTok (sixty-two per cent), Twitter (forty-one per cent) and Facebook (thirty-four per cent) (Piper Sandler, 2020).

Mondres (2019) suggested that it has been found that sixty per cent of Generation Z won’t utilise applications or websites which “load” (Mondres, 2019, p.26) at a decelerated pace or which are challenging in terms of exploration. Another report by UNiDAYS/Ad Age (2018) focused on marketing
to this generation. This report, named ‘Gen Z: Decoding the Digital Generation’, put forward five myths and debunked these. A sample of over twenty-two thousand participants responded to a survey, and this sample hailed from a quartet of different locations, as before: Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom and New Zealand. Their age is described as “college-age” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.2). First off, this report proposes that a smart-phone is possessed by ninety-eight per cent of Generation Z and there are ninety-five per cent with “laptops” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.2) in their possession (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). The first myth put forward was that Generation Z will react more positively to messages conveyed digitally, as compared to via other types of media. This myth was debunked by the proposal that it is not as straightforward as that, and that Generation Z generally do not tune into a digital traction unless it is of importance for them. For example, it was found that over half do not “click” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.2) on advertisements which feature on websites, during the time in which they are visiting a given website. Whilst the majority (fifty-six per cent) do not click advertisements that feature on websites, almost eighty-five per cent reported focusing on advertisements displayed digitally in places that advertisements are usually found, such as in shopping centres, for example (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). The key message here is that advertising material developed for Generation Z needs to be curated to suit them specifically and it is essential to utilise “not only the channels but the actual platforms they frequent” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.3). The second myth put forward is that Generation Z is not willing to spend money to utilise apps. This is debunked as it is suggested that Generation Z of “college-age” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2019, p.3) in general are employed and they were found to be prepared to spend money to use the following categories of apps. Firstly, over sixty-five per cent are willing to spend money to use apps related to music. Secondly, thirty-one per cent are willing to spend money to use apps in the “game and entertainment” category (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.3). Almost one quarter is willing to spend money to use apps related to health. Eighteen per cent are willing to spend money to use apps related to improving their “utility and productivity” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.4). The third myth proposed is that “Gen Z is slowly forgetting about traditional media formats like TV sets and paperback books” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.4). Firstly, the majority has
made the move to using “streaming services” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.4) such as Netflix, as opposed to using a traditional TV, showing that they have made moves towards new forms of media. In line with the proposal that Generation Z still do engage with traditional media, is the finding that seventy-seven per cent of the sample were found to engage with books in print format (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). This finding is also in line with that of Vercelletto (2019). In contrast to the myth that Generation Z do not value their privacy online, for example, seventy-eight per cent only allow a specific number of apps, not every app, to have access to data relating to their location (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). It is suggested that Snapchat is a preferred social media platform given that the messages on Snapchat vanish after they have been viewed (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). It is suggested that Facebook and Twitter are the inclinations of preceding generations however these social media platforms are considered to be “far less anonymous” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.5). The final myth that is debunked in this report is that in relation to shopping, Generation Z utilise mobile devices first or possibly mobile devices only. In contrast to the myth put forward, for example, one finding shows that six out of ten were inclined towards purchasing items on their computer, as opposed to using their mobiles (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). Just over two out of ten preferred the Internet browser on their phones, fifteen per cent preferred purchasing items on apps on their mobiles and just three per cent showed an inclination towards buying items on their tablet-style devices (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). A majority of participants did, however, use their mobiles for aspects of shopping such as browsing and researching (looking at “prices”, “reviews” and “availability” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.6)), however not actually purchasing (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). In summary, the statistics relating to purchasing shows that this generation is not mobile-only when engaging in shopping.

JWT Intelligence carried out research in May 2019, where members of Generation Z from the United Kingdom and the United States both participated. Over one thousand two hundred participants partook, and these participants made use of their smartphone device one time each day at a minimum. Sonar™ (“JWT’s proprietary online research unit” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.43)) was utilised to do this and the aim was to investigate
the ways in which Generation Z show their creativity on the Internet and not on the Internet (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019). Fifty-one per cent of respondents said that their generational group has greater levels of “creativity” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.44) than generations that have gone before them (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019). In this research, 55% of the respondents said they find that, that which they “experience” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.45), which is not online, presents less creativity than do “social apps and the internet” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.45). In relation to this sample’s stimulus for their creative endeavours, almost fifty per cent responded that their “inspiration” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.50), comes from “social apps” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.50), forty-four per cent said that this comes from “friends and family” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.50), and finally forty per cent responded that it comes from their “personal experiences” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.50). Finally, this cohort was asked to cultivate a mantra for Generation Z, and the majority put forward forms of the mantra “be yourself” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.51). The second most suggested motto was related to accountability of a societal nature, such as “save the planet” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.51) and “we want change” (JWT Intelligence study in partnership with Snap Inc., 2019, p.51).

In 2019, a paper called ‘Gender variations in social media usage and academic performance among the students of University of Sharjah’ was put forward by Alnjadat et al. (2019). Just over half of the sample were between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-five. This paper found that among a sample of university students, the addiction to social media was higher for males than it was for females (Alnjadat et al., 2019). It is interesting to note that there is not a wide scope of academic literature available on the gender differences relating specifically to social media platforms. This may be because such data would possibly be outdated by the time it gets published.

TikTok is suggested to have user numbers surplus to eight hundred million (Fromm, 2020). It is suggested that across over one hundred and fifty
nations, this social media platform has been downloaded on one-and-a-half billion occasions (Fromm, 2020). Fromm discussed TikTok with Kieran Mathew (Fromm, 2020). The first thing Mathew notes is that TikTok is popular as it facilitates individuals in becoming influencers as the rates of development for the best entertainers are high and it offers the potential opportunity to become an influencer (Fromm, 2020). Mathew suggests that the app also allows users to be themselves (Fromm, 2020). Mathew notes that users aged between sixteen and twenty-four years old account for over four in ten users on TikTok, and nine in ten of that group use the app more than a single time each day (Fromm, 2020). Mathew suggests that each TikTok user uses the app with sound on, as opposed to in silence. As per Mathew, this is the opposite to the fact that most social media channels’ material is viewed with sound off (Fromm, 2020). Mathew suggests that users who are spending time on TikTok spend more time looking at novel material creators than they do engaging with the material of creators they are following since a previous date (Fromm, 2020). As described by Mathew, “In contrast, TikTok users spend most of their time on the ‘for you page’ which showcases content from all users on the platform. Some of the content is viral while other content is local and will have very little views or engagement. This is why I feel that the platform has democratized virality, it is providing everyone with the opportunity to be discovered, not just prioritizing content from people who have already amassed a large audience.” (Mathew cited in Fromm, 2020, online article, np). This is in agreement with what has been proposed by Anderson (2020), who suggests that those without a following will be discovered, as their videos will be presented on the “feeds” (Anderson, 2020, n.p.) of users using the app. In this regard, Tolentino (2019, n.p.) described TikTok as “a social network that has nothing to do with one’s social network”.

2.5.11 Generation Z and Health and Wellness
An additional report by UNiDAYS/Ad Age (2018) looks at Generation Z in terms of health and wellness. It was found, among over 12,000 participants from a quartet of countries: America, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand, that over seven out of ten respondents reported that the issue related to health that is most significant to them is managing their “stress” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.2) levels as well as managing their “mental health” (UNiDAYS/Ad
Age, 2018, p.2). Just under seven out of ten responded that having well-proportioned food consumption is of grave importance. Just over six out of ten report that getting physical activity is an issue of high importance to them. Six out of ten report that attaining adequate levels of sleep is also of considerable significance (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). It is pointed out that word-of-mouth references from close relations such as members of their “family” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.3) or members of their friend circle, are where this sample hear about new dining outlets (eighty-two per cent) and “gyms” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.3) that are new (sixty-four per cent) (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). Just over seven in ten of this sample learn of new dining outlets and new exercise outlets via social media (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). Another interesting finding is that while over half of the sample would use a delivery service which delivers healthy food (in meal format) each week if it existed and was accessible, over nine in ten purchase their household shopping in a physical retail outlet instead of using online grocery shopping facilities (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). Just under half exercise on up to three occasions weekly and just under two in ten get physical exercise on between four and five occasions per week (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). Just under half utilise fitness applications, including over sixty-five per cent who utilise apps relating to exercise, just over five in ten utilise apps that facilitate dieting or tracking the consumption of food, and just under three in ten utilise “wearable technology” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.5) to record exercise and food consumption (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). Whilst over half of females were found to use applications that relate to dieting, only thirty-seven per cent of males use these. Just under half of the females surveyed reported that they consider weightloss of significance, whereas twenty-seven per cent of males said the same. Forty-three percent of respondents were found to exercise where they live, and over thirty per cent use an exercising facility that is separate to their “school” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.6). Twenty-three per cent use their schools’ exercise outlets (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). In terms of fee-paying exercise facilities such as gymnasiums which offer their facilities for a fee to those who subscribe or “personal training” (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018, p.6) offerings, almost six in ten would consider spending as much as $20 on a monthly basis or less for such offerings, whilst just over two in ten would consider spending up to
the amount of $50 or less on a monthly basis for same (UNiDAYS/Ad Age, 2018). A limitation of the report associated with these findings is that in the majority of cases, it does not present the specific findings related to Generation Z in each of the four geographical locations from which respondents were from. This would be insightful as it would potentially show differences between Generation Z in different geographical contexts. Instead, it is overall results of the research by UNiDAYS/Ad Age (2018) that are reported, relating to the complete sample that participated in this research.

2.5.12 Generation Z around the world

In the previous sections, a myriad of studies have been described which relate to samples of Generation Z from many locations around the world. Some examples of these various locations will be described as follows. Starting with Francis and Hoefel, who, in association with McKinsey & Company, (2018) carried out research on Generation Z in a Brazilian context. The findings in relation to this research are outlined in section 2.5.1. YSI and Amárach Research published three different sets of results from their research on Generation Z in an Irish context (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a; 2019b; 2019c). The results of the three sets of findings from YSI and Amárach Research are presented in section 2.5.3. Iorgulescu (2016) investigated Generation Z in a Romanian context in 2016, regarding their future working careers. The findings of Iorgulescu’s (2016) study are presented in section 2.5.4. Similarly, Băltescu (2019) looked at Generation Z, in a Romanian context, as tourists. The results of this study (Băltescu, 2019) are presented in section 2.5.8. Fratričová and Kirchmayer (2018) looked at Generation Z, again in relation to work, in a Slovakian context. The results of Fratričová and Kirchmayer’s (2018) study are also presented in section 2.5.4. In an American context, several research undertakings have occurred, focusing on Generation Z. In section 2.5.6, a range of studies e.g., Porter, Novelli/Cone (2019); Parker, Graf and Igielnik (2019); APA (2018); Barnes and Noble College (n.d.); and their associated findings in relation to Generation Z are presented. Piper Sandler’s (2020) findings and Piper Jaffray’s (2019) findings also relate to Generation Z in an American context. The results of Piper Sandler’s (2020) research and Piper Jaffray’s (2019) research are presented in section 2.5.10. Priporas, Stylos and Fotiadis (2017) investigated
Generation Z as consumers in the context of the United Kingdom. The findings in relation to the research by Priporas, Stylos and Fotiadis (2017) are presented in section 2.5.8. Iványi and Bíró-Szigeti’s (2019) study looked at Generation Z in relation to festivals in Hungary, the results of which are presented in section 2.5.9.

In an additional study, in a South African context, Bornman (2019, p.1) investigated how Generation Z see leadership, and what they have an inclination towards, in terms of “leadership style”. It is noted that a drawback of Bornman’s (2019, p.5) study is that “the sample may not be representative of the entire population group”. Data from three hundred and twenty respondents proceeded to the analysis stage of the research (Bornman, 2019). For both male and female respondents, it was found that “traits” associated with females were viewed as being of greater value, than were those “traits” associated with males (Bornman, 2019, p.6). Those “leadership traits” that were viewed as optimal by the Generation Z respondents were “[t]ransformational” and “servant” (Bornman, 2019, p.6). Males respondents had elevated scores, in the main, when in contrast with female respondents, in the extent to which they see the following leadership styles: “transformational” and “transactional” (Bornman, 2019, p.6), however, these differences were not of significance statistically. Additional limitations with regard to this study included, but were not limited to, the inability to confirm the “reliability” of three of the scales used to quantify different elements under measurement in the study (Bornman, 2019, p.9).

2.6 Events and Festivals
The following sections will explore the existing literature on events and festivals, in a number specific areas. In a 2008 paper, Getz suggested that “[p]lanned events are spatial–temporal phenomenon, and each is unique because of interactions among the setting, people, and management systems—including design elements and the program. Much of the appeal of events is that they are never the same, and you have to ‘be there’ to enjoy the unique experience fully; if you miss it, it’s a lost opportunity.” (Getz, 2008, p.404). ‘Festival’ as a term arose from the Latin word for feast which is ‘festum’ (Isar, 1976 cited in Quinn, 2006, p.290). Festivals have been described by Getz (2005 cited in Getz, 2010, p.2) as occasions of revelry with a premise, which are not held in a private
manner. Getz and Wicks (1993, p.2 cited in Skoultos and Tsartas, 2009, p.296) describe event tourism as “…a systematic planning, development, and marketing of festivals and special events as tourist attractions, image-makers, catalysts for infrastructure and economic growth and animators of built attraction”. Quinn (2006) discusses how festivals differ from events, saying that the term ‘event’ does not sufficiently incorporate the intricacies in social form that are associated with festivals. Quinn (2006) notes that while “festivals are events” (Quinn, 2006, p.304), festivals have lasting social purposes where short-term events may not. Skoultos and Tsartas’ (2009) paper suggests that in relation to those events which are held in rural locations, although resources of a monetary nature come into the location, it is not sufficient to stimulate development in that community area (Skoultos and Tsartas, 2009). Getz (2008) suggests that the perspective of Destination Management Organisations (DMOs) or those involved in developing events, is that events are “highly valued as attractions, catalysts, animators, place marketers and image-makers” (p.406). There are a number of types of events and events overall have been categorised in a number of ways. For example, Getz (2005 cited in Getz, 2008, p.404) put forward 8 types or categories of events. “[P]lanned events” were categorised by Getz (2005 cited in Getz, 2008, p.404) under the following headings: “Cultural Celebrations” (including events such as “festivals”), “Political and State” (including events such as “royal occasions”), “Arts and Entertainment” (including events such as “awards ceremonies”), “Business and Trade” (including events such as “trade shows”), “Educational and Scientific” (including events such as “conferences”), “Sport Competition” (including events such as “spectator” or “participant” events), “Recreational” (including events such as “games for fun”) and “Private Events” (including events such as “weddings”) (Getz, 2005 cited in Getz, 2008, p.404). Getz (2008) suggests that an overall all-inclusive approach to examining an individual’s tourism experience is desirable. Getz (2008) proposes that one ought to understand the status of an individual based on a number of aspects before the event, i.e., “the needs, motivations, attitudes and expectations brought to the event” (p.414), to their experience of being present at the given event, to subsequent post-event thoughts about the event and its semantics and how the event impacts on the subsequent behaviour of an individual. Getz (2008) suggests, for example, that an “event designer” may want to enable their

2.6.1 Typology of events

Getz’ (2005 cited in Getz, 2008, p.407) puts forward the portfolio approach to viewing events, with four event categories presented. These are “Occasional Mega Events”, “Periodic Hallmark Events”, “Regional Events” and “Local Events”. In Getz’s (2008) paper, namely ‘Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research’, Mega Events are associated with “tourist attractiveness and related image-making or developmental roles” (Getz, 2008, p.407). Marris (1987 cited in Getz et al., 2012, p.50) suggest that attendee numbers at mega events should be surplus to a million, and in addition, the event should be considered unmissable. They should have the capacity to gain traction in the media on a global level (Vanhove and Witt, 1987 cited in Getz et al., 2012, p.50). Getz (2007 cited in Getz et al., 2012, p.50) described them as events so large that they deliver powerful impacts on the destination in which they are held, including, but not limited to, impacts related to the degree of tourism and the economy of the destination. Hallmark events are described by Getz (2005, p.16 cited in Getz, 2008, p.407) in the following way: “…‘hallmark’ describes an event that possesses such significance, in terms of tradition, attractiveness, quality, or publicity, that the event provides the host venue, community, or destination with a competitive advantage. Over time, the event and destination can become inextricably linked, such as Mardi Gras and New Orleans.”. “[R]egional” and “[I]local” (Getz, 2008, p.407) events may or may not be tourism oriented (Getz, 2008). In relation to festivals, a typology is set out by O’Sullivan and Jackson (2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302). O’Sullivan and Jackson’s (2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) festival typology mainly classifies festivals in relation to their size (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302). Elements including size, the body of people running the festival, the objectives of the festival and where the festival takes place are considered by this classification system (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, pp.302-303). Home-grown festivals are
suggested to be more minor, located moreso in the countryside as opposed to in urban environments, steered by a volunteer or volunteers in the community and can funded by public and private monies. In general, it is suggested that these festivals are held to serve the community and those visiting the locality (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, pp.302-303). Tourist-tempters, alternatively, are bigger than the home-grown festivals and are organised by the local authority, to create tourism and in turn, to augment the local economy (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, pp.302-303). These festivals are proposed to be held in less rural settings than the home-grown festivals also (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, pp.302-303). Finally, big-bang festivals are those that are held in towns and cities, and are run by parties in “partnership” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302). The main objective of these festivals is the partners’ financial gain and benefits for the people living locally as well as those visiting the locality, in terms of amusement and exposure to culture (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, p.303).

2.6.2 Festivals and events as part of tourism strategy
Events can offer a host destination a key advantage which enables that destination to have a unique offering that other destinations cannot offer (Soteriades and Dimou, 2011). Events are suggested to be a means by which the negative effects of seasonality can be combatted (Connell, Page and Meyer, 2015). In 2018, Fáilte Ireland asserted that festivals would make up a core part of plans which have been developed to “grow tourism, extend the season and spread tourism benefits across the country” in 2019 (Fáilte Ireland, 2018, n.p.). Trying to diminish seasonality remains difficult to “tourism destinations” (Connell, Page and Meyer, 2015, p.283) on an international level (Connell, Page and Meyer, 2015). Tourism Ireland’s (2018) report entitled ‘Island of Ireland 2017 Overseas Tourism Performance Facts and Figures’ reported that top places for tourists to go to on the island of Ireland were “Dublin, the South West and Northern Ireland” (Tourism Ireland, 2018, n.p.). Focusing on just one element of tourism, the accommodation sector, Fáilte Ireland’s (2018) report on the performance of tourism accommodation from January to September 2018 indicated that Dublin
had a greater “bed occupancy” (Fáilte Ireland, 2018, n.p.) than the other counties across the nation at sixty-nine per cent (Fáilte Ireland, 2018). This was followed by regions in the Wild Atlantic Way and Ireland’s Ancient East, which had bed occupancies of fifty per cent each (Fáilte Ireland, 2018). Areas within the realm of Ireland’s Hidden Heartlands had a bed occupancy percentage of just forty-four per cent (Fáilte Ireland, 2018). In 2018, approximately 4 out of 5 “tourist bed nights” (Fáilte Ireland, 2018, n.p.) were dispersed across only five counties in Ireland (Fáilte Ireland, 2018). Fáilte Ireland (2019) suggested that festivals would also be used as a tool to help to disperse the positive accruals of tourism across all of Ireland.

2.6.3 Economic benefits of festivals and events

Festivals in Ireland are suggested by Ciara Sugrue, whose role is ‘Head of Festivals’ with the organisation ‘Fáilte Ireland’, to facilitate excellent tourist “experiences” and allow tourists to enjoy Irish culture, the people of Ireland and various locations in Ireland optimally (Fáilte Ireland, 2018, n.p.). Sugrue suggested that Fáilte Ireland had the goal of increasing the number of tourists holidaying in Ireland to go to festivals to 300,000 in the next four years (by 2022). It is suggested by Fáilte Ireland (2018, n.p.) that festivals had been identified in other agendas which were put forward by the organisation as a “key component to continue to grow tourism, extend the season and spread tourism benefits across the country”. The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport (2015) cited Dublin’s St. Patrick’s Festival as a significant attraction for tourists from outside of Ireland. The 5,000 sub-events which made up the Gathering Ireland 2013 also served to attract approximately 275,000 visitors to various parts of Ireland (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015). In section 1.4 of the report named ‘The People Place and Policy Growing Tourism to 2025’, it is suggested that “Events will continue to be an important part of the Irish tourism offering…” (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015, p.31). In terms of events that attract tourists to Ireland, the types of events that are mentioned in this document are as follows: global events that visit Ireland, mass participation events, events involving sports that take place each year, large-scale festivals that take place each year, events and festivals that take place in different locations in Ireland, and corporate events associated with
tourism (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015).

2.6.4 Social benefits of festivals and events

Some of the economic benefits of festivals have been outlined above. In addition, the positive social impacts of festivals are of significance (e.g., Arcodia and Whitford, 2006). It was noted by Arcodia and Whitford (2006) that festivals, at the time of their study being published, were considered to be an area of advancement and vivacity globally. Festivals were also suggested to be platforms which bestow effects upon the area in which they are held, in “economic, socio-cultural, and political” form (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006, p.2). One example of this is Wilks’ (2011) finding that the strengthening of previously established connections occurred at festivals associated with music. In relation to the Gathering, Mottiar, Quinn and Ryan (2014) investigated the advantages associated with the community and advantages in a social sense, that emerged as a result of events associated with the Gathering in Co. Kerry and Co. Westmeath. Among the findings was one related to the engagement of communities, and it was found that just over six in ten participants within the community felt that the Gathering facilitated the community in coming together (Mottiar, Quinn and Ryan, 2014). Over half of the event organisers who participated in the research said that the Gathering facilitated the development of a future image or “vision” (Mottiar, Quinn and Ryan, 2014, p.19) for the location which had not previously existed. The Gathering was also suggested to develop “pride of place” (Mottiar, Quinn and Ryan, 2014, p.7) and “self-belief” (Mottiar, Quinn and Ryan, 2014, p.7) (Mottiar, Quinn and Ryan, 2014). Over half of respondents in the community also felt that the Gathering provided members of the community with a supportive push in relation to engaging in volunteering (Mottiar, Quinn and Ryan, 2014). The Gathering is a comprehensive example of how social benefits were bestowed on communities via the undertaking of various events. The Arts Council of Ireland (n.d.) in a report entitled ‘Making Great Art Work: Festival Policy and Strategy 2018’, suggest that festivals facilitate the arts, in that they allow access to the arts for a wide spectrum of civilians and help the arts sector to widen its spectators. Festivals enable the arts to be accessed in areas where traditionally there would have been little interaction with the arts, and simultaneously provide a platform for those working in the arts to showcase their
work (The Arts Council, n.d.). In summary, The Arts Council’s report suggests that the significance of festivals relates to the “unique opportunities they provide for presenting and experiencing art” (The Arts Council, n.d., p.2). The Making Great Art Work Festivals Policy & Strategy 2018 also suggests that “festivals are recognised by the Arts Council as providing an environment for creative risk-taking, concentrated and critical appraisal of work, peer networking, and mentoring and exposure to national and international work of calibre, all of which can contribute to an artist’s professional-skill development” (The Arts Council, n.d., p.2).

An example of how a mega-event, namely the Winter Olympics of 2002, affected a community, namely “Heber Valley” (Cope et al., 2015, p.136), can be seen in Cope et al.’s (2015) research. Data was gathered over five years from 1999 to 2003 and again in 2007, therefore this study was longitudinal. It was found that in the year that the Olympics were held, the “community satisfaction” (Cope et al., 2015, p.149), scores among the residents were at the most elevated level, however this was apparent for a short-term duration. The mega-event, however, had no impact on the sample’s scores in constructs “social ties” (Cope et al., 2015, p.148), or “community attachment” (Cope et al., 2015, p.149) (Cope et al., 2015). Hixson (2014) investigated the impacts that two different events in Australia, namely, Clipsal 500 and Adelaide Fringe Festival, had on the youth, those aged between sixteen and nineteen, who lived in that area. These two events were not found to have a significant influence on the growth of this sample’s identity (Hixson, 2014). With regards specifically to Adelaide Fringe Festival, this study found those who were attendees were considered to be involved at a low level while those who participated were considered to be involved at a high level (Hixson, 2014). Those who attended or spectated were suggested to have experienced short-term positive impacts, while those who were more involved experienced alternative positive impacts which were more persistent (Hixson, 2014). Thus, such event impacts on an individual in a society wherein an event takes place can be dependent on the role of that same individual (Hixson, 2014).
2.6.5 Festival funding

In the festival sector, especially for festivals that are free for attendees, sourcing funding can be difficult (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015). It is suggested that plenty of festivals rely on the financial support of both public bodies and sponsorship from private bodies (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015). Fáilte Ireland affords funding each year and the amount provided depends on “the overall Exchequer allocation to Fáilte Ireland” (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015, p.32). It is suggested that those events which show promise for generating the largest amount of “overseas” (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015, p.33) income should be prioritised in terms of funding (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015). Secondly, a given event’s capacity to facilitate an overseas visitor to engage with the people who live in the area wherein the event takes place, and the capacity of the event to make the area wherein the event is held to come alive, should be considered (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015). A third consideration would be the event’s contribution to “offsetting seasonality” (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015, p.33). Funding for events will be biased towards contributing to events that align with such considerations (The Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, 2015). In 2019, Fáilte Ireland announced that funding worth almost three million euro would be made available for forty festivals already in existence in Ireland, as well as novel festivals (Fáilte Ireland, 2019). Specifically, €570,000 of the overall fund of almost €3 million was set aside for Local Authorities to provide for two hundred and fifty regional festivals in the “Regional Festivals and Participative Events” category (Fáilte Ireland, 2019, n.p.). In 2016, it was found that local authorities backed over 1,400 events and festivals which were held to revere the resources and culture in various regions in Ireland (“County and City Management Association (CCMA)”, 2017 cited in ITIC, 2018, p.83). The Arts Council of Ireland gave financial assistance to over one hundred and fifty low-amplitude festivals across Ireland in 2017 as well as enabling twenty-two Local Authorities to facilitate festivals to be held within each Local Authority’s area (The Arts Council, n.d.). In the same year, The Arts Council also developed the Festival Investment Scheme (FIS), to invest in small festivals and facilitate their growth, which has a budget of €1.4 million
Finally, in 2017, The Arts Council provided continued financial assistance for 26 festivals, to the value of €5.95 million (The Arts Council, n.d.).

2.6.6 Festival motivation

Motivation is described by Schultheiss et al. (2009) as the centre between an individual and the setting in which they find themselves. The following paragraphs summarise the literature relating to event and festival motivation.

Chang and Hsieh (2017) looked at both residents’ (hosts) (n=730) and tourists’ (guests) (n=435) perceptions regarding a festival taking place in a location named Hualien, Taiwan in 2016. When the two groups were compared, there was a significant difference in the advantages felt from the “recreation experience of the festival” by hosts, compared to guests (Chang and Hsieh, 2017, p.6). When compared to guests, hosts also had higher likelihood of feeling that “local development” (Chang and Hsieh, 2017, p.6) was an advantage that emerged from festivals (Chang and Hsieh, 2017). Residents (hosts) were also found to have higher scores on “festival identification and recognition” (Chang and Hsieh, 2017, p.7). The questionnaire also measured festival support and residents (hosts) also scored higher here than did guests (tourists) (Chang and Hsieh, 2017).

Kim, Uysal and Chen (2001) examined festival and event organisers’ perspectives on why attendees attend festivals, that is, what motivates them. Respondents participated via “questionnaires” (Kim, Uysal and Chen, 2001, p.129). The two items relating to motivation which were ranked the highest by these event and festival organisers were as follows. The first was “To observe the other people attending the festival” (Kim, Uysal and Chen, 2001, p.130). The mean for this item was 3.20. Five was the highest score as participants appraised the items relating to motivation based on how significantly they viewed them, on a scale of one to five (Kim, Uysal and Chen, 2001). The second was “Because I enjoy festival crowds” (Kim, Uysal and Chen, 2001, p.130). The mean for this item was 3.15. The two items that were appraised as the least motivating by the festival and event organisers overall were firstly “To experience new and different things” (Kim, Uysal and Chen 2001, p.130). The mean for this was 2.12. The second was “Because I like the variety of things to see and do” (Kim, Uysal and Chen, 2001, p.130). The mean for this was 2.07. The dimensions
related to motivations that resulted from the data provided by this sample of
event and festival organisers were as follows: “Social/Leisure, Event Novelty,
Family Togetherness, Escape and Curiosity” (Kim, Uysal and Chen, 2001,
p.132). This study showed that some differences existed between what these
organisers saw as the main motives of attendees, compared to literature focusing
on attendee’s perspectives on their motives for attendance (Kim, Uysal and
Chen, 2001). Numerous other studies exist which explore the motivations of
festival and/or event attendees (e.g., Crompton and McKay, 1997). Among the
various motives cited in studies exploring attendees’ motives, a number of
researchers found that family or family togetherness relate to event motivation
(e.g., Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993; Duran and Hamarat, 2014; Lee, Lee and
Wicks, 2004). The opportunity for escape is another widely cited construct
related to motivation to attend (e.g., Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004; Uysal, Gahan
and Martin, 1993). In a similar way, cultural exploration was found to be related
to motivation to attend (e.g., Duran and Hamarat, 2014; Lee, Lee and Wicks,
2004; Crompton and McKay, 1997). Research in this area has also cited
excitement/thrills (e.g., Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993; Formica and Uysal,
1996) and also some variation of socialisation, sociability or socialising as
motives (e.g., Park, Reisinger and Kang, 2008; Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004;
Crompton and McKay, 1997; Formica and Uysal, 1996; Uysal, Gahan and
Martin, 1993). External Socialisation and Known-Group Socialisation (or close
variations of these terms) have also emerged as factors in event motivation
studies (e.g., Crompton and McKay, 1997; Lee, 2000).

Event Attractions has emerged as a factor connected to event motivation
within the literature (e.g., Lee, 2000; Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004). Lee’s (2000)
review of the established festival motivation research suggests that between five
and six of the same factors seem to emerge, including “‘socialization’, ‘family
exploration’, ‘event attractions’ and ‘entertainment’” (Lee, 2000, p.171). In
Lee’s (2000) own research regarding Kyongju World Cultural Expo, the
following constructs were found to explain just over sixty-four per cent of the
variance in the motivation of visitors: “cultural exploration”, “family
togetherness”, “escape”, “novelty”, “external group socialization”, “event
attractions” and “known-group socialization” (Lee, 2000, p. 173).
In Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004) study, among the factors that explained event motivation, Event Attractions explained just over nine per cent of the variance. In all, the following constructs explained almost sixty-two of the variance explained in Lee, Lee and Wicks’ research in relation to festival motivation: “cultural exploration, family togetherness, novelty, escape, event attractions, and socialization” (Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004, p.69).

The literature pertaining to the topic of event attendees’ motives suggests that a core set of motives exist in relation to why individuals choose to participate in events (e.g., Crompton and McKay, 1997). Yolal et al.’s (2012, p.66) study set out to accomplish three goals. First, these authors intended to look at the motives of event-attendees of a festival taking place in Turkey which featured a number of different “festival products” including “symphony, rock, world music, dance, ballet, and theater” (Yolal et al., 2012, p.66). It was intended that an investigation would take place focusing on these various products and gleaning whether there were differences in the motives relating to these alternative products. Yolal et al. (2012) also investigated how those who visited the festival saw the festival’s “socio-economic impacts” and whether there were differences in how these were seen by different categories of festival-goers. Thirdly, Yolal et al.’s (2012) study looks at “satisfaction” among visitors to the “Eskisehir International Festival” regarding the alternative products of same (Yolal et al., 2012, p.66). Surveys were completed by over five hundred and twenty participants who visited the festival. Post-analysis, five motivational dimensions emerged from the data (Yolal et al., 2012). Over sixty-four per cent of the variance was accounted for by these factors, which were as follows: “socialization”, “excitement”, “event novelty”, “escape” as well as “family togetherness” (Yolal et al., 2012, p.73). Approximately fifty-six per cent of the variance in “socio-economic impact” was explained by the following factors which emerged from the data analysis, these were “community cohesion and social benefits” and “economic benefits”, as well as “social cost” (Yolal et al., 2012, p.74). With regards to four of the motivational dimensions, there were statistically “[s]ignificant differences” between the “festival products” (Yolal et al., 2012, p.74). The four motivational dimensions to which this applied were “excitement, festival novelty, escape, and family togetherness” (Yolal et al., 2012, p.74). Statistically significant
differences did not emerge when the “festival products” (that is, the six different sets of respondents) were compared in terms of views on “socio-economic impact” (Yolal et al., 2012, p.76). Each set of participants responded that they perceived the advantageous impacts emanating from festivals to be of greater consequence than the disadvantageous impacts emanating from same (Yolal et al., 2012). There were no statistically significant differences between sets of respondents on the variable “satisfaction” (Yolal et al., 2012, p.78).

In a number of studies, significant differences were found between varying demographic groups in relation to the strength of a given motive for event participation (e.g., Duran and Hamarat, 2014). For example, gender differences were found in research by Duran and Hamarat (2014). Females were found to be more motivated to attend festivals by the pursuit of “family togetherness” (Duran and Hamarat, 2014, p.146) and “cultural exploration” (Duran and Hamarat, 2014, p.146), while male participants were more motivated by the prospect of “escape” (Duran and Hamarat, 2014, p.146) and the prospect of excitement as well as the attractions of the event, than they were by the motive of “family togetherness” (Duran and Hamarat, 2014, p.146). Findings such as those discussed above by Duran and Hamarat (2014) emphasise the importance of segmenting event-goers when attempting to ascertain specific groups’ motives for attending events.

Vinnicombe and Sou’s (2017) paper discusses how many festival motivation studies do not differentiate between the motives of two different segments of attendees of festivals, those who reside locally and those who attend the festival who are from elsewhere, i.e., tourists to the area. Similarly, the proposal that the motivation items utilised in many studies are adapted from tourism studies and not generated from an event standpoint (e.g., Maeng, Jang and Li, 2016) is discussed, although Vinnicombe and Sou (2017) argue that events and festivals are community-based first and foremost, and not primarily developed for tourists. Vinnicombe and Sou’s (2017) paper focuses specifically on festivals related to music to decipher if a specific set of motives which are applicable to all attendees of festivals of this type can be delineated. This is carried out via a literature review and by conducting a case study on the “28th Macau International Music Festival (MIMF)”. This is a festival relating to
“western classical music”, held in Macau, China (Vinnicombe and Sou, 2017, p.276). Vinnicombe and Sou (2017) reviewed ten festivals related to music and found that the principal motive or motive that came second in line, in terms of significance, related to the music element of the festival, thus, it was festival-specific, for seventy per cent of the festivals under review. In investigating motives of local attendees and tourist attendees of the MIMF, two motivation dimensions were generated (“the music” and “socialization and escape”) among the sample of local individuals, and the variance explained by these amounted to just over fifty-two per cent (Vinnicombe and Sou, 2017, p.286). Three factors were generated among the tourist attendee participant sample: “the music”, “socialization and escape” and ‘cultural exploration” (Vinnicombe and Sou, 2017, p.286). Just over sixty-seven per cent of the variance was explained (Vinnicombe and Sou, 2017). The results of the case study are in line with the results of the literature review of the nine music festival studies, in that the motive which is festival-specific, i.e., music in this case, is the principal motive for both segments: the local sample and the tourist sample.

Matheson, Rimmer and Tinsley (2014) carried out a study focusing on the Beltane Fire Festival which takes place on the last day of April each year in Edinburgh. This study’s goal was to delineate the motives of those who went to the festival and to test items related to “spiritual attitude”, which were intended for use in measuring same (Matheson, Rimmer and Tinsley, 2014, p.16). The study also intended to decipher if “spirituality” was an influence of note in investigating the “intentions” of those who attended the festival (Matheson, Rimmer and Tinsley, 2014, p.16). A duo of factors which were motivational in nature were generated from the data in relation to the festival under investigation, Beltane Fire Festival. The first was “escape” and the second was “cultural adventure” (Matheson, Rimmer and Tinsley, 2014, p.27). The third factor that was generated from the analysis was “spiritual attitude” (Matheson, Rimmer and Tinsley, 2014, p.28). This was not motivational in nature, instead, it was associated with attitude (Matheson, Rimmer and Tinsley, 2014).

Nicholson and Pearce (2001) focused on four alternative festivals in New Zealand’s South Island, investigating attendee motivations at each and
comparing these motives. The objective of the study was to investigate whether
the same set of motives would emerge among attendees of the four alternative
events, or whether there would be dissimilarities in the set of motives that
emerged among attendees for each alternative event (Nicholson and Pearce,
2001). The study aimed to contribute and push forward the existing research on
the topic of “event motivation” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.449) and also to
begin to build knowledge in relation to event motivation in New Zealand
(Nicholson and Pearce, 2001). Five events were initially chosen to be compared
and one was then excluded due to a “low response” rate at that festival
(Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.450). The four festivals that were compared were
as follows: “the Marlborough Wine, Food and Music Festival” (Nicholson and
Pearce, 2001, p.450), the “Hokitika Wildfoods Festival” (Nicholson and Pearce,
2001, p.450), “Warbirds over Wanaka” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.451) and
the “New Zealand Gold Guitar Awards” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.451),
Firstly, in terms of findings, the responses to an “open-ended question”, as
follows “Why did you come to this event?” were analysed (Nicholson and
Pearce, 2001, p.452). Responses given to this for all four events were mainly
related to the particular features and what the event was based on (Nicholson and
Pearce, 2001). Different motives related to socialisation were noted to be second
in line in terms of importance among attendees of each of the four events and
differing motives related to “novelty or curiosity” are also apparent in data
emanating from each of the four events (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.452).
Some alternative motives of less importance were also found (Nicholson and
Pearce, 2001). For all but one event, the main motive emerging from the “20
motivational statements” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.452) included in the
questionnaire, the primary motive emerging from the data analysis was a motive
that related to the particular event, that is, a motive associated an element of the
event that was “event-specific” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.453). Where this
motive wasn’t the principal motive for one event, this motive came next in line
after the principal motive, again showing the significance of “event-specific”
(Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.453) motives. For each event, a specific set of
motives emerged from a “principal components analysis” (Nicholson and Pearce,
(Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.455), the factors that emerged were as follows, in
order of the amount of variance explained by each from highest to lowest: “event socialization”, “event novelty/uniqueness”, “escape” and “family” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.455). Almost fifty-nine per cent of the variance was explained by this group of factors (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001). For “The Hokitika Wildfoods Festival”, “event socialization”, “event novelty/uniqueness”, “entertainment/excitement/people”, “escape” and “family” emerged as the motivational factors, in order from highest to lowest in terms of how much variance was explained by each (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001). In this case, almost sixty per cent of the variance was explained (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001). For “Warbirds over Wanaka”, “event novelty/uniqueness”, “event socialization”, “specifics”, “escape” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.455) and “family” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.456) emerged as factors. These are listed in order from highest to lowest in terms of how much variance was accounted for by each one, with sixty-four per cent of the variance being explained by these factors together (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001). Finally, for the “New Zealand Gold Guitar Awards”, almost seventy-one per cent of the variance was explained by the six following factors together: “specifics/entertainment”, “escape”, “variety”, “event novelty/uniqueness”, “family” and “event socialization” (Nicholson and Pearce, 2001, p.456). These are listed in order from highest to lowest in terms of how much variance was explained by each. It therefore appears, with reference to Nicholson and Pearce’s (2001) study, that the motivations of event attendees do differ from one event to the next.

A study carried out in a Canadian context conducted data collection at six festivals which related to music, in Quebec. The study’s purpose was to “to examine the relationships between a music festival's program and its attendees by identifying their motivations and by segmenting attendees according to their motivations” (Perron-Brault et al., 2020, p.8). Four categories of attendees emerged from the findings, namely: “enthusiasts, open to discoveries, looking for stars and just for my bands” (Perron-Brault et al., 2020, p.5). This study found all four categories of festival attendees had statistical differences in terms of motives (Perron-Brault et al., 2020). This study also found that there were differences between the categories of attendees in terms of what they desired from festival programmes and similarly, they differed in terms of the demographics that
characterised them (Perron-Brault et al., 2020).

In a study by Choo, Ahn and Petrick (2016), data was collected from a sample of festival attendees at the Nonsan Strawberry Festival in South Korea. Data was collected in the year 2012 and the year 2013, at the festival itself (Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016). The study aimed to identify what determined the plans of the attendees of the festival to re-attend (Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016). “Satisfaction” (Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016, p.818) was the construct that predicted the attendees’ plans to re-attend the most (Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016). The second construct that was found to predict the attendees’ plans to re-attend was “social identity” (Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016, p.818). Following those two constructs was “subjective norms” (Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016, p.818). Fourthly, “group norms” (Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016, p.818) was found to predict attendees’ plans to re-attend the festival (Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016).

This exploratory study will specifically identify the motives of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. To date, it appears that there are no festival motivation studies that have investigated the differences in festival motivation among Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

2.6.6.1 Perceived popularity

One of the constructs that will be included in the current study, is Perceived Popularity. The current study will investigate if it plays a part in the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. In terms of perceived popularity, it was intended that this construct would measure if Generation Z festival-goers attend festivals to gain popularity, or if they attend festivals as they think that they would be perceived as more popular if attending a festival that everyone else appears to be attending. In Park, Reisinger and Kang’s (2008) study, “Social Status” (p.174) accounted for just over eleven per cent of the variance in motivation for those who had not attended before. This motivational dimension was suggested to be “based on seven items reflecting the importance of improving social status, being popular among friends, and sharing knowledge of the festival with others” (Park, Reisinger and Kang, 2008, p.174). As mentioned in previous paragraphs and as pointed out by Choo, Ahn and Petrick (2016) who mention alternative research (Schofield and Thompson, 2007 cited in
Choo, Ahn and Petrick, 2016, p.821), socialisation has emerged within the literature as one of the typical motives for festival attendees (e.g., Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004). Overall, the construct, Perceived Popularity, was included to investigate if the opportunity to appear more popular accounted for any of the variance in Attendance among the sample of Generation Z that were to participate in the current study.

2.6.7 The exploration of experiences
Getz (2008) discusses how events should be looked at from three perspectives at the same time, namely “conative” (p.414) and “affective” (p.414) perspectives as well as cognitive. The cognitive perspective includes what individuals are attentive of, what they observe and what they comprehend. The “conative” (p.414) aspect relates to what actions individuals are undertaking (Getz, 2008). The “affective” (p.414) relates to what individuals are feeling (Getz, 2008). Getz (2008) suggests that events should be understood thoroughly. The starting point of this is pre-event, where an individual will have feelings, motives and so forth. Secondly, there is the experiential element, where an individual experiences a live event. Finally, there is the post-event contemplation wherein an individual thinks about what semantics emerged from the event, and this effects the behavioural actions of the individual in time to come (Getz, 2008, p.414).

2.6.8 The Experience Economy
The experience economy is posited to be an economy distinct from that involving the consumption of commodities, products and services (Pine and Gilmore, 1998). Pine and Gilmore (1998) describe four forms of experiences: entertaining experiences, educational experiences, experiences that enable participants to escape and aesthetic experiences. The authors also propose that the experiences with the most appeal are those that include elements of each of the four types of experiences, that is, those experiences that offer entertainment, education, escapism and aesthetics (Pine and Gilmore, 1998). Manthiou, Lee, Tang and Chiang (2014) point to the importance of these experiential elements, as they found that these four dimensions influence the vividness of the sample’s memory in a festival context. Two of the experiential dimensions, namely entertainment and esthetics influenced loyalty (Manthiou, Lee, Tang and Chiang,
Semrad and Rivera (2018) looked at whether the 5Es (“entertainment, education, esthetics, escapism and economic value”) (Semrad and Rivera, 2018, p.61) determined whether Generation Y (Millennials) would have an experience that was significant and that would be remembered, and if they would subsequently engage in Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM) (electronic communications in word-of-mouth format that emerge online e.g., on social media) after attending a music festival on a small island destination (SID). This study was set in the context of the Aruba Electric Festival in Aruba, a Caribbean island. In sum, the two hypotheses of the study were firstly that a positive connection would be found to be present between “the 5Es (overall experience) and memorable festival experience” (Semrad and Rivera, 2018, p.61) and secondly that a positive connection would be found to be present between “memorable festival experience and electronic world of mouth (eWOM) for the festival” (Semrad and Rivera, 2018, p.61). It is suggested by these authors that marketing activities like eWOM are “cost effective, extend market reach and acquire international tourists as attendees” (Semrad and Rivera, 2018, p.60). Structural Equation modelling was utilised to test the connections between the constructs under investigation (Semrad and Rivera, 2018). It was found that festival organisers ought to produce festivals with the 5Es amalgamated, which would lead to a significant experience associated with memories, and Generation Y attendees (Millennials) would then be inclined to engage in eWOM (Semrad and Rivera, 2018). Whilst almost 40% of the variance in eWOM was explained by this model, there is scope for further research to investigate what other influences are at play here that may explain the variance further (Semrad and Rivera, 2018).

2.7 Flow
It is suggested that those attendees who are “highly ‘involved’” (Getz, 2008, p.414) may be more likely to feel flow (Getz, 2008). Havitz and Mannell (2005) examined ‘Enduring Involvement’, ‘Situational Involvement’ and ‘Flow’ in their study. In this study, Situational Involvement “mediated” (Havitz and Mannell, 2005, p.70) the relationship between Enduring Involvement and Flow (Havitz and Mannell, 2005). Flow has been defined in a number of ways. Jackson and Marsh (1996, p.18) describe the experience of flow in the following way:
“[w]hen in flow, a person becomes totally involved in an activity and experiences a number of positive experiential characteristics, including freedom from self-consciousness and great enjoyment of the process. Flow is an intrinsically enjoyable state and is accompanied by an order in consciousness whereby the person experiences clarity of goals and knowledge of performance, complete concentration, feelings of control, and feelings of being totally in tune with the performance”. Flow is proposed by Mannell, Zuzanek and Larson (1988 cited in Havitz and Mannell, 2005, p.160) to be the degree of feeling, vividness and focus which an individual is experiencing when engaging in an exercise or act. Csikszentmihalyi (1975 cited in Havitz and Mannell, 2005, p.160) associated flow with elevated focus, the degree of an individual’s cognisance of self or depletion of self-consciousness. Flow has been measured a number of ways, including within a experimental setting (e.g., Mannell and Bradley, 1986 cited in Havitz and Mannell, 2005, p.159), using questionnaires which required participants to think retrospectively (e.g., Jackson and Marsh, 1996) and using the “experience sampling method (ESM)” (e.g., Larson, Mannell and Zuzanek, 1986 cited in Havitz and Mannell, 2005, p.160). Jackson and Marsh (1996) developed the Flow State Scale (FSS) and required that participants retrospectively thought about an “optimal experience” (Jackson and Marsh, 1996, p.22) they had relating to a physical activity experience which they took part in, when responding to the scale. Their scale was directly related to measuring flow experiences in situations characterised by “sport and physical activity” (Jackson and Marsh, 1996, p.29).

2.8 Social Capital
Felitti and Fiore (2012 cited in Yeoman, 2013, p.251) posit that increasingly, consumers are engaging in experiences that appeal to them for a number of reasons. Engaging in such experiences also allows them the opportunity to present themselves in a positive light among their peers (Felitti and Fiore, 2012 cited in Yeoman, 2013, p.251). Festivals offer attendees the opportunity to accumulate social capital, that is, a sort of social currency which Yeoman (2013) describes as enabling consumers to display personal success in a way that is more subtle than showing off via material possessions. In recent years, the inclination to show off material goods as emblems of success has waned, and
increasingly, “our accomplishments and talents and wider interests which have become the new form of currency” which are used to present success (Yeoman, 2013, p.256). Yeoman (2013) suggests that at the time of writing his paper, “…it is the festival that you attended or the book that you have read that is strong demonstration of one’s social capital” (p.256). In Yeoman’s (2013) forecast, it was predicted that we would see individuals develop collections of their experiences at festivals and events in time to come. StubHub (n.d.) suggest in their report named ‘2017 Year in Live Experiences’, that close to eight in ten participants in their research share content “about live event experiences on social media” (StubHub, n.d, p.6). It was found that forty-eight per cent of female event attendees share content while an event is happening, and the same could be said for thirty-six per cent of male event attendees (StubHub, n.d.). It’s also suggested that, in terms of sharing content while an event is happening, a comparison of generations reveals that Generation Z and the Millennials’ propensity to do so is more elevated than that of the two generations preceding them, the Baby Boomers and Generation X.

Fáilte Ireland (2017) discussed Social Energisers, whom are described by Fáilte Ireland as a market that keeps a flexible itinerary while on their holidays, which ensures that they will be able to avail of experiences that evoke envy and are revelations, in that they have not been incorporated into the itinerary in advance. Fáilte Ireland (2017) suggest that such experiences allow them to share and show off online, “via social media” (Fáilte Ireland, 2017, p.3). Although the term ‘Social Capital’ does not appear in the report, the suggestion that Social Energisers engage in opportunities “to share and brag via social media” (Fáilte Ireland, 2017, p.3) is akin to what Yeoman (2003) has proposed is associated with the term. While the report suggests that this cohort’s main motives are comparable regardless of age, it does suggest some differences which are determined by age, for example, it is suggested that Millennials have a higher probability of using social media platforms to “share” (Fáilte Ireland, 2017, p.4) what they have experienced immediately (Fáilte Ireland, 2017). Festivals and entertainment at night in metropolitan areas are also more popular among this group (Fáilte Ireland, 2017). Fáilte Ireland (2017) describes Social Energisers as seeking out holiday locations which offer, among other elements, a “strong energetic vibe, good nightlife, a good local entertainment scene and festivals”
What they also seek out is potential experiences which offer them “valued bragging rights” (Fáilte Ireland, 2017, p.6) such as “surprises and unplanned local experiences which feeds their sense of spontaneity, novelty and indulgence” (Fáilte Ireland, 2017, p.6). It is suggested that this market will share their experiences using imagery on “social media” (Fáilte Ireland, 2017, p.13) platforms, whilst in destination and that businesses should facilitate this by suggesting that they will capture the image for the visitors or with the provision of elements that add to the photography such as “props” (Fáilte Ireland, 2017, p.13), and urge the capturing and sharing of such imagery (Fáilte Ireland, 2017). It is suggested that after the trip, this same cohort of Social Energisers will verbally talk about what they have experienced and will also do so online on social media platforms (Fáilte Ireland, 2017). After their trip, they want to show off using their experiences and perceive that the more unusual the experience is, the more enhanced it is. It is suggested by Fáilte Ireland (2017) that this reinforces Social Energisers’ “self-image” (p.13). Finally, it is suggested by Fáilte Ireland (2017) that destinations ought to ensure that all of the novel and emerging events that will take place in the area should be advertised, as this group do not like to miss any opportunities that may interest them. In addition to some other recommendations, Fáilte Ireland (2017) suggest that destinations ought to push tourists to capture and share imagery of what they have seen or been present for, on social media platforms. In order to facilitate this, there should be Wi-Fi that at no cost as well as “lots of photo-opportunity prompts which encourage social media conversation” (p.14).

Interestingly, Mair and Weber (2019) wrote in their editorial piece reviewing the current literature in the events and festivals area and areas wherein research would be of worth, that there has been a paucity of research done which concentrates on social media at festivals, despite the suggestion that social media platforms are prevalently used in relation to festivals and are closely connected to festival marketing. In contrast to the current study, Perron-Brault et al. (2020) suggest that they would consider what is labelled in the current study as ‘Social Capital’ not to be a motivation dimension in and of itself, but a sub-stream of socialisation: “…while it is true that festival-goers may be motivated to attend an event in order to publicly display their attendance, share their stylish outfit and exhibit their friendships on social networks, we argue that this constitutes one of
the components of the “socialization” dimension of motivation and not a new dimension per se” (Perron-Brault et al., 2020, p.10).

There is a distinction to be made here between the type of social capital described by Yeoman, and the concept of social capital which is written about by Robert Putnam. Putnam, in his book named ‘Bowling Alone: the collapse and revival of American community’ (2000), describes social capital in a different way. Putnam describes social capital as “connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (Putnam, 2000, p.19). However, it is the concept of social capital described by Yeoman (2013), and the opportunity to accumulate social capital as a motive to attend festivals, which will be under investigation for the purposes of this study.

2.9 Motivation and Behaviour

The following paragraphs will explore existing literature pertaining to motivation and behaviour, as well as inhibition, all of which are measured in the current research, and which relate to the objectives of the current research.

2.9.1 Motivation

Crompton and McKay (1997) assert that when an individual chooses to attend a festival, it is a choice that is made in order to satisfy a “need” (Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.425). Motives are considered by these authors to be the catalyst that begins the course of decision-making, but are among a myriad of influences that account for one’s behaviour (Crompton and McKay, 1997). There are three reasons put forward by Crompton and McKay (1997) as to why festival goers’ motives should be well-comprehended. The first is so that the “design” (Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.426) of the festival will match the needs of those who attend (Crompton and McKay, 1997). Understanding motives should be of high importance given the strong association individuals’ motives have with those same individuals’ fulfilment (Crompton and McKay, 1997). Dann (1981 cited in Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.426) is in agreement with this statement, proposing that investigating satisfaction without also investigating motivation would not be prudent. Thirdly, the marketing undertakings will be more effective if the motives of festival attendees are noted and put in order of importance, as the way that the festival attendees make decisions will be better comprehended (Crompton and McKay, 1997). Crompton (1979 cited in Crompton and McKay,
1997, p.427) describes motivation associated with tourism as being the result of an imbalance within an individual. Specifically, the “needs” (Crompton, 1979 cited in Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.427) of a person create an imbalance which needs to be re-balanced and this is achieved by taking a given deed (Crompton, 1979 cited in Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.427). There are a number of theoretical frameworks proposed to explain tourism motivation (e.g., Maslow, 1943 cited in Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.427; Iso-Ahola, 1982 cited in Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.428). These include Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943 cited in Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.427) which asserts that an individual has different categories of needs, ranging from basic to more advanced needs. The theory suggests that an individual is motivated to meet his or her most basic needs initially. The individual will only be motivated to meet “safety” needs after his or her “physiological” needs are met, followed by his or her “social” needs, his or her “esteem” needs and finally his or her “self-actualization” needs (Maslow, 1943 cited in Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.427). The existing literature relating to the motives of festival and/or event attendees will be outlined in forthcoming paragraphs.

2.9.2 Behaviour

In relation to behaviour, it is suggested that there is actually little agreement among researchers with regards to what behaviour is, and how to define it (Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009). A research paper by the aforementioned authors outlines several different definitions of the concept, from “[t]he total movements made by the intact animal.” (Tinbergen, 1955 cited in Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009, p.6) and “[a] response to external and internal stimuli, following integration of sensory, neural, endocrine, and effector components. Behavior has a genetic basis, hence is subject to natural selection, and it commonly can be modified through experience.” (Starr and Taggart, 1992 cited in Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009, p.7) to “[b]ehavior can be defined as the way an organism responds to stimulation.” (Raven and Johnson, 1989 cited in Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009, p.7) and “[a]ll observable or otherwise measurable muscular and secretory responses (or lack thereof in some cases) and related phenomena such as changes in blood flow and surface pigments in response to changes in an animal's internal and external environment” (Grier and Burk, 1992 cited in Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009, p.7). Levitis, Lidicker
and Freund (2009) suggest that although in recent years, we have gained a greater comprehension of behaviour, newer definitions for the term that align with this updated comprehension have not emerged. These authors conducted a study which investigated whether there would be general agreement among “members” (Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009, p.5) of three alternative societies which composed “journals” (Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009, p.5) relating to behaviour in the biological sense, namely the “Animal Behavior Society, International Society for Applied Ethology, and Society for Plant Neurobiology” (Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009, pp.5-6). It was found that the participants’ responses (n=174) were incongruous and were not in alignment with established definitions of behaviour either. In turn, these authors put forward a new definition for the term, stating behaviour is “the internally coordinated responses (actions or inactions) of whole living organisms (individuals or groups) to internal and/or external stimuli, excluding responses more easily understood as developmental changes” (Levitis, Lidicker and Freund, 2009, p.10). In agreement with the findings of this study, Uher (2016) claims that the literature on behaviour lacks a definitive and adequate definition of the term. The author suggests that this is due to the fact that researchers tend to embrace an instinctual comprehension of the concept as it is so innate and inherent to our lives (Uher, 2016). It is the behaviours and motivations of Generation Z festival goers in Ireland that are under investigation in this study, and whilst behaviour is difficult to quantify, it is the main characteristics of their behaviour and the behaviours that they do engage in which will be central to the investigation of the current study.

2.9.3 Inhibition

As Generation Z have grown up in a world where the Internet has always existed (Prensky, 2001 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104), it was of interest to see if this has any effect in terms of leading to more inhibited behaviours at festivals. A behavioural inhibition scale, as developed by Gest (1997 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.332) and Muris et al. (1999 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.332) was tested on a cohort of individuals aged around the same age as college students by Shatz (2005). It is proposed that Kagan (1997 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.331) and Kagan, Reznick and Sniderman (1987 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.331) put forward the concept of behavioural inhibition that is related to the variance among people in the degree
of “shyness, fear and withdrawal reactions” exhibited “when encountering novel or unfamiliar situations”. It is suggested that each person’s individual differences in behavioural inhibition remains similar from when one is a young child until one is a teenager (e.g., Gest, 1997 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.332) and Kagan, Reznick and Sniderman (1988 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.332). Shatz (2005) suggests that it could be forecasted that one’s individual differences in this characteristic may also persist as one enters the first stage of one’s life as an adult.

2.10 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the existing literature pertaining to a number of aspects of the research at hand, starting with generations and Generation Z. The literature review pertaining to Generation Z was intended to give the reader an insightful overview on what is currently known in relation to Generation Z. Existing literature pertaining to events and festivals was identified and described. Literature relating to Flow and Social Capital, two constructs which are measured in the current study, were discussed. Motivation, behaviour and inhibition were subsequently explored.
Methodology

3.1 Introduction
The goal of the current study is to identify the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland and to answer the following research question: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’. The function of chapter three, the methodology chapter, is to clearly explain how the current research was undertaken. The reasoning behind choosing a mixed method approach will be described. In addition, this chapter will include an identification of the research objectives. The epistemological perspective of the current study and the two samples that participated in the current study will be described. Both the quantitative and qualitative data collection stages will be portrayed, as will the ethical considerations relating to these two stages.

This research undertook a mixed method approach, which involved collecting qualitative and quantitative data and analysing both of these data sets. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) suggest that taking a mixed methods approach enables a researcher to make use of the benefits of the two alternative methods and to reduce the limitations of same within their research study. While both methods have advantages and disadvantages and while one method may be more suitable in certain circumstances and vice versa, at times, combining the discernments and techniques of the two alternative methodologies may result in a “superior product” (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.17).

3.2 Overview of Research Methods
The primary research undertaken in order to meet the objectives of each study comprised self-administered questionnaires and in-depth interviews. Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to members of early Generation Z (n=150), those aged between eighteen and twenty-three years old at the time of the study. In addition, three in-depth interviews were carried out with leaders in the festival industry or tourism sector, to investigate the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Thus, two diverse samples were recruited to participate in this study. The means in which these research participants were recruited are described later in this chapter. Firstly, those aged
between eighteen and twenty-three years old at the time of this study, namely early Generation Z festival-goers, were recruited to participate in the self-administered online survey. This resulted in data collection of a quantitative nature. Festival-goers were chosen to respond to the survey as the researcher was interested in the motivations and behaviours of those who attend festivals. The scope of the study was not broad enough to also investigate members of early Generation Z who do not attend festivals and why that is. Further research may be of use to investigate this. The reason for not including any younger participants is because it is generally those aged eighteen or over that attend festivals and are possibly either partially or fully financially independent. A secondary consideration here was that parental consent was not required for those aged eighteen or over to participate. The second sample in this research involved three leaders in the festival industry or tourism sector. In-depth interviews were conducted in-person with these participants. Three in-depth interviews were undertaken in order to achieve a more in-depth understanding of the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, to attempt to add depth and wider perspective to the quantitative data collected.

The primary research phases took place sequentially, with the quantitative data collection taking place first, followed by the qualitative data collection. The aim was for the in-depth interviews to further delve into the findings that emerged from the quantitative data obtained from early Generation Z via the self-administered surveys. Ivankova, Creswell and Stick (2006) describe a “sequential explanatory” (Ivankova, Creswell and Stick, 2006, p.5) approach, proposing that “[i]n this design, a researcher first collects and analyzes the quantitative (numeric) data. The qualitative (text) data are collected and analyzed second in the sequence and help explain, or elaborate on, the quantitative results obtained in the first phase. The second, qualitative, phase builds on the first, quantitative, phase, and the two phases are connected in the intermediate stage in the study” (Ivankova, Creswell and Stick, 2006, p.5). Ivankova, Creswell and Stick (2006) proposed that a mixed methods “sequential exploratory” (Ivankova, Creswell and Stick, 2006, p.4) design can prove complicated to carry out. Their paper, namely, ‘Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice’ intended to supply
readers with pragmatic information regarding the challenges that this methodological approach may present.

Secondary research comprised a comprehensive literature review on Generation Z, events and festivals and other topics related to the research. Articles were sourced on the IT Tralee library database (e.g., EBSCO), Google Scholar, ResearchGate as well as from a number of other locations.

3.3 Aims and Objectives
The overall goal of the current research is to answer the following research question: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ Thus, the aim of this research is to gain an understanding of the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z in relation to festivals in Ireland, in order to enhance the production of festivals in Ireland and facilitate their success with this generational cohort and to bridge what appears to be a gap in the literature in the field of festival motivation research. It was intended that new findings would emerge from this study which would add to what is already known about the topics related to this research.

The current study had five objectives and it was hoped that by meeting these objectives, the overall aim of the research would be achieved. The objectives of the research are outlined in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Research objectives

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To determine the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how Generation Z festival-goers interact with festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers' level of attendance and participation at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers' behaviour at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To identify the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research questions pertaining to the current study are outlined in Table 3.2
Table 3.2 Research questions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What are the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>To what extent does technology shape how Generation Z festival-goers interact with festivals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What are the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers’ level of attendance and participation at festivals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What are the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers’ behaviour at festivals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What is the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Epistemological perspective

The research philosophy of the current study was interpretivist. This was the research philosophy that determined the principles directing the research and determined the methods used as part of this research study (Ryan, 2018). Interpretivism is the ontological perspective of this research. The values of the research are relativist, meaning that it is believed that each person’s view of the world is subjective, depending on the way it is seen and the way it is experienced by each person (Ryan, 2018). The epistemological position of this study was pragmatism. It is suggested that a mixed methods approach is linked with pragmatism in that “it offers an immediate and useful middle position philosophically and methodologically; it offers a practical and outcome-oriented method of inquiry that is based on action and leads, iteratively, to further action and the elimination of doubt; and it offers a method for selecting methodological mixes that can help researchers better answer many of their research questions” Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, p.17). Although there was a lack of existing literature focusing on Generation Z’s motivations and behaviours in relation to festivals in Ireland, a number of hypotheses were put forward in relation to the current research. These will be outlined in section 3.6.1.

3.5 Overview of research design

An overview of the research design is outlined in Table 3.3
Mixed methods was the chosen approach in this study as it is suggested by Creswell (2009) that employing both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods facilitates a broader comprehension of the topic under investigation than using either quantitative or qualitative data collection methods solely. In the context of the current research, this was the reasoning behind choosing to undertake a mixed method design. Bazeley (2004) suggests that although a mixed methods approach may be undertaken to enhance the existing knowledge regarding a given research area, this approach cannot be said to have greater or less validity than would using any other approach. The level of validity of any approach emerges from the efficiency of the application of the approach and the thorough and balanced consideration of the findings emerging from the application of that methodological approach (Bazeley, 2004). On the other hand, Grbich (2013) proposes that combining both approaches does augment the validity of the research outcomes, facilitates explanation and allows for more responses to be garnered from diverse viewpoints as well as allowing for checking of a given dataset in comparison to an alternative dataset and vice versa.

The quantitative data collection methods comprised of data collection via an online self-administered survey containing reflective and formative statements that were used to measure the motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Reflective statements that measure a construct are “interchangeable” (Gaskin, 2016, n.p.). For example, in this study, ‘Known Group Socialisation’, was measured. This was a reflective construct in that all of the items used to measure it were considered substitutable. For example, two of the items used to measure this construct were ‘Festivals allow me to be with my friends.’ and ‘I like to go to festivals with a friend group.’. On the other hand, formative constructs are made up of items that are not exchangeable, and each serves to measure some aspect of the construct. For example, a “…number of
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<th>Table 3.3 Research design</th>
</tr>
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<td>Qualitative research</td>
</tr>
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</table>
indicators to form a construct without any assumptions as to the patterns of inter-correlation between these items” can be utilised (Coltman et al., 2007, p.1). An example of this in the current study is the construct ‘Flow’ which is formative. Two examples of items from Flow are as follows: ‘The way time passed at the festival seemed to be different from normal.’ and ‘I was not concerned with what others may have been thinking of me at the festival.’. These are not substitutable items and this is what differentiates them from reflective items – they may measure different aspects of a construct.

The qualitative data collection comprised of semi-structured interviews with leaders in the festival industry or tourism sector, in order to gauge these participants’ insights into the motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. The interviews were semi-structured in nature so that if any unanticipated topics emerged during the conversation with interviewees, these would be accommodated and could potentially be used as part of the findings of the research subsequently. The researcher was open to unanticipated findings emerging and being of value to the overall research. This interview format is suggested by Kallio et al. (2016, n.p.) to be “a popular data collection method” because “it has proved to be both versatile and flexible” (Kallio et al., 2016, n.p.). An identified benefit of this method, for example, is that it facilitates “reciprocity between the interviewer and participant” (Galletta, 2012, cited in Kallio et al., 2016, n.p.).

As the data collection methods undertaken as part of research were sequential, they will also be described as such, with the quantitative data collection being described first, followed by the qualitative data collection. The design was sequential with the qualitative data collection depending on the results of the data collected at the quantitative data collection stage. The relationship between the quantitative sample and the qualitative sample was “multilevel” (Onwuegbuzie and Collins, 2007, p.292). A “multilevel” (Onwuegbuzie and Collins, 2007, p.292) relationship refers to employing multiple samples from diverse “populations” (Onwuegbuzie and Collins, 2007, p.292).
3.6 Quantitative data collection

The research in question used quantitative data, in the form of an online self-administered survey, to identify the motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z in relation to festivals in Ireland. The survey was responded to by a sample from the overall population of early Generation Z (eighteen to twenty-three year olds) in Ireland. The survey tested a number of hypotheses regarding the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z attendees in relation to festivals in Ireland. An online survey was utilised as it allowed the researcher to reach a wide spectrum of early Generation Z festival-goers. While the researcher considered attending various festivals and attempting to recruit participants who were in attendance, the presence of the researcher may have caused respondents to answer in a different way than they might if the researcher was not present. Joinson’s (1999) study required participants (n=82) to respond to a survey either online or in hard-copy format, and either as anonymous participants or not as anonymous participants. Focusing specifically on findings related to social desirability, it was found that social desirability scores were most elevated among those answering in a scenario where the surveys they were completing were in hard copy format, and the same participants were not anonymous. In contrast, the opposite was found for those who completed soft copy versions of the survey online, as anonymous participants. In addition, the researcher would not have been able to attend a large multitude of festivals, due to financial and time limitations. The survey would need to be disseminated online regardless of if it was feasible to go to a number of festivals to recruit participants, in order to get an adequate number of respondents. Thus, it was considered preferable to disseminate the survey online only, to ensure that the presence of the researcher could not potentially influence the answers of a fraction of the respondents who may have been recruited while at given festivals. An online survey was used to gather data from Generation Z in Puiu’s (2017) study and in the Porter Novelli/Cone (2019) Purpose Study. In a study by Valet, Adriaans and Liebig (2019, p.471), it was found that when the person conducting the interview was present, this had the impact of elevating instances of “nonreporting”, but did not influence levels of “misreporting” in the context of responding to questions related to income received before tax or any other relevant charges. Nine per cent less of the respondents who were administered the survey by another person (the
“interviewer”, Valet, Adriaans and Liebig, 2019, p.482) supplied a response in relation to how much income (before tax or any other relevant charges were deducted) they received, when compared to those who completed the survey by themselves, without an interviewer being in their company. The current study’s online self-administered survey required an answer to each question or statement, thus non-reporting was not a potential issue. However, Valet, Adriaans and Liebig’s (2019) study shows that the presence of an interviewer may be influential upon responses.

3.6.1 Hypotheses of the current study

The hypotheses of the current study are outlined in Table 3.4

Table 3.4 Hypotheses of the current study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis (H)</th>
<th>Effect of Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 a-f</td>
<td>Cultural Exploration, External Socialisation and Known-Group Socialisation are proposed to have a direct effect on Perceived Popularity and Social Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 a-f</td>
<td>Perceived Popularity and Social Capital are proposed to have a direct effect on Attendance, Event Anticipation and Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 a-c</td>
<td>Perceived Popularity is proposed to mediate the effect of Cultural Exploration, External Socialisation and Known-Group Socialisation on Attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 a-c</td>
<td>Perceived Popularity is proposed to mediate the effect of Cultural Exploration, External Socialisation and Known-Group Socialisation on Event Anticipation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 a-c</td>
<td>Perceived Popularity is proposed to mediate the effect of Cultural Exploration, External Socialisation and Known-Group Socialisation on Flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 a-c</td>
<td>Social Capital is proposed to mediate the effect of Cultural Exploration, External Socialisation and Known-Group Socialisation on Attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7 a-c</td>
<td>Social Capital is proposed to mediate the effect of Cultural Exploration, External Socialisation and Known-Group Socialisation on Event Anticipation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8 a-c</td>
<td>Social Capital is proposed to mediate the effect of Cultural Exploration,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Socialisation and Known-Group Socialisation on Flow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H_9$ a-c</th>
<th>Inhibition moderates the positive effect of Perceived popularity on Attendance, Event Anticipation and Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_{10}$ a-c</td>
<td>Inhibition moderates the positive effect of Social Capital on Attendance, Event Anticipation and Flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.2 Rationale for hypotheses

The rationale for the above hypotheses is described in the following paragraphs.

3.6.2.1 Rationale for hypotheses relating to Attendance

- It was anticipated that the opportunity to explore culture would motivate Generation Z to attend festivals, as Cultural Exploration has been found to be related to attendee motivation in a number of studies (e.g., Duran and Hamarat, 2014; Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004; Crompton and McKay, 1997).

- It was anticipated that the opportunity to meet new people would motivate Generation Z to attend festivals, as External Socialisation (or a variation of same) has been found to be related to attendee motivation in a number of studies (e.g., Crompton and McKay, 1997).

- It was anticipated that the opportunity to strengthen current friendships or connections would motivate Generation Z to attend festivals as Known Group Socialisation (or a variation of same) has been found to be related to attendee motivation in a number of studies (e.g., Crompton and McKay, 1997).

- It was anticipated that Generation Z would be motivated to attend festivals to experience culture, which might increase their Perceived Popularity.

- It was anticipated that Generation Z would be motivated to attend festivals to meet new people, as this may have the effect of increasing their Perceived Popularity.
• It was anticipated that Generation Z would be motivated to attend to strengthen connections with existing friends which may result in an increase in Perceived Popularity.

• It was anticipated that Generation Z’s motivation to explore culture would result in attendance, as Cultural Exploration may allow one to accumulate Social Capital.

• It was anticipated that Generation Z would be motivated to attend to meet new people, as doing so may contribute to their acquisition of Social Capital.

• It was anticipated that Generation Z would be motivated to attend to strengthen their relationships with current friends, as doing so may facilitate the acquisition of Social Capital.

3.6.2.2 Rationale for hypotheses related to Event Anticipation
  • It was anticipated that the opportunity to explore culture would result in Event Anticipation. This was rationalised as being a logical expectation, as Event Anticipation has not been investigated within the festival motivation literature to date.

  • It was anticipated that the opportunity to meet new people would result in Event Anticipation. This was rationalised as being a logical expectation, as Event Anticipation has not been investigated within the festival motivation literature to date.

  • It was anticipated that the opportunity to strengthen current friendships would result in Event Anticipation. This was rationalised as being a logical expectation, as Event Anticipation has not been investigated within the festival motivation literature to date.
• It was anticipated that Generation Z would look forward to festivals as they would have the opportunity to experience culture which might increase their Perceived Popularity.

• It was anticipated that Generation Z would look forward to festivals as they would have the opportunity to meet new people which may have the effect of increasing their Perceived Popularity.

• It was anticipated that Generation Z would look forward to festivals as they would have the opportunity to strengthen connections with existing friends which may result in an increase in Perceived Popularity.

• It was anticipated that Generation Z would look forward to festivals as they would have the opportunity to explore culture, and Cultural Exploration may allow one to accumulate Social Capital.

• It was anticipated that Generation Z would look forward to festivals as they would have the opportunity to meet new people, and doing so may contribute to their acquisition of Social Capital.

• It was anticipated that Generation Z would look forward to festivals as they would have the opportunity to strengthen their relationships with current friends, and doing so may facilitate the acquisition of Social Capital.

3.6.2.3 Rationale for hypotheses related to Flow

• It was anticipated that the opportunity to explore culture would result in Flow. This was rationalised as being a logical expectation, as Flow has not been investigated within the festival motivation literature to date.

• It was anticipated that the opportunity to meet new people would result in Flow. This was rationalised as being a logical expectation, as Flow has not been investigated within the festival motivation literature to date.
It was anticipated that the opportunity to strengthen current friendships would result in Flow. This was rationalised as being a logical expectation, as Flow has not been investigated within the festival motivation literature to date.

It was anticipated that Generation Z would experience Flow as they would have the opportunity to experience culture, which might increase their Perceived Popularity.

It was anticipated that Generation Z would experience Flow as they would have the opportunity to meet new people, which may have the effect of increasing their Perceived Popularity.

It was anticipated that Generation Z would experience Flow as they would have the opportunity to strengthen connections with existing friends, which may result in an increase in Perceived Popularity.

It was anticipated that Generation Z would experience Flow as they would have the opportunity to explore culture, and Cultural Exploration may lead to the accumulation of Social Capital.

It was anticipated that Generation Z would experience Flow as they would have the opportunity to meet new people, and doing so may contribute to their acquisition of Social Capital.

It was anticipated that Generation Z would experience Flow as they would have the opportunity to strengthen their relationships with current friends, and doing so may facilitate the acquisition of Social Capital.

3.6.3 Sample 1: Early Generation Z
Data was collected from two diverse samples in the current study. The first sample included those from early Generation Z. Early Generation Z comprised
those aged between eighteen years old and twenty-three years old at the time of this research. The category of sampling employed here is known as “simple random sampling” (Onwuegbuzie and Collins, 2007, p.285). Such sampling involves selecting a sizeable number of respondents from a specific population. In simple random sampling, each potential participant from within the specific research “population” has the same opportunity to be selected to participate (Onwuegbuzie and Collins, 2007, p.285). This type of sampling is chosen if the research study aims to “generalize” about the specific research population (Onwuegbuzie and Collins, 2007, p.285).

This sample was firstly recruited to respond to the self-administered online survey when it was piloted. A pilot study was carried out to check if any revisions were needed and to ensure that the delivery of the online survey was straightforward and user-friendly. The pilot survey was a first draft of the self-administered online survey and it was disseminated to thirteen individuals within the target sample. Secondly, this sample was recruited to participate in the final self-administered survey which was distributed and responded to in the form of a self-administered online survey. One hundred and thirty-one participants aged between eighteen and twenty-three years old completed the online questionnaire which included reflective and formative statements, measuring this population’s motivations and behaviours in relation to festivals in Ireland. The survey was open between mid-May to late August 2019. A calculator online (Soper, n.d.) was used to determine how many participants would be required to respond to the survey. Entering the following data, the minimum sample size which was deemed necessary was 88 participants:

- Anticipated effect size: 0.4
- Desired statistical power level: 0.8
- Number of latent variables: 10
- Number of observed variables: 44
- Probability level: 0.05

3.6.4 Quantitative Data Collection via Self-administered Survey

A self-administered online survey was used to gather quantitative data. The relationships between nine latent constructs were measured in the final survey,

Table 3.5 Constructs measured as part of this research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct name</th>
<th>Operational definition of the construct in this exploratory study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Exploration</td>
<td>The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals for cultural experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Socialisation</td>
<td>The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals to make new connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Group Socialisation</td>
<td>The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals to strengthen their current connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>The degree to which Generation Z are motivated to go to festivals in order to show off their experiences potentially via social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Popularity</td>
<td>The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals to enhance their image in their social system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>The degree to which Generation Z attendees felt in the moment and mindful of what was taking place while they attended their chosen festival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>The degree to which Generation Z attendees anticipate attending festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition</td>
<td>The degree to which the participant shows “individual differences in shyness, fear and withdrawal reactions when encountering novel or unfamiliar situations”. This definition was proposed by Kagan (1997 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.331) and Kagan, Reznick and Sniderman (1987 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.331).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The control variable Social Desirability, was measured in this survey using a 10-item scale adapted from Strahan and Gerbasi (1972). Event Attractions was measured using a scale adapted from an ‘Event Attractions’ scale cited in research by Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004). Control variables are feasibly confounding variables that ought to be present in the model despite having no part to play in our proposed theory. Control variables are implied to impact the
dependent variables in the proposed Structural Equation Model (SEM) model but are not of such specific interest as hypothesised effects are. The survey captured moderators (multi-grouping), measured categorically, such as the participants’ gender within the demographic form, and ‘Inhibition’, which will function as another type of moderating variable (interaction), which is measured continuously. Moderators serve to contextualise explored effects. For example, a proposed relationship between variables may be amplified or dampened for one gender type over another. The proposed model in Figure 3.1 outlines the proposed relationships between these variables. Structural equation modelling (SEM) facilitates such a proposed model that includes latent (not directly measurable) constructs which are measured reflectively and formatively. SEM also facilitates mediation and multi-group comparisons for selected relationships. Table 3.6 outlines the items related to each construct measured, which featured in the quantitative data collection, via the online self-administered survey. These items can be seen as they were presented within the survey in Appendix C.

![Figure 3.1 Proposed Structural Equation Model](image)

**Moderators:**
- Multi Group: ‘Gender’, ‘Education Level’
- Interaction: ‘Inhibition’

**Controls:**
- ‘Social Desirability’, ‘Event Attractions’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variable (Type)</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cultural Exploration (Reflective)           | • While at festivals, I like to experience customs and cultures different from those in my own environment.  
• While at festivals, I seek out cultural events that I do not normally have the opportunity to go to.  
• My ideal festival involves looking at things I have not seen before.  
• I want there to be a sense of discovery involved as part of my festival experience.  
• I want to see new things while at festivals.  
• I like to find myself in situations where I can explore new things.  
• While at festivals, I like to increase my knowledge of local culture. |
| External Socialisation (Reflective)         | • I hang out with new people at festivals.  
• I chat with new people at festivals.  
• I learn from new people at festivals.  
• I meet new people who enjoy the same things as I do at festivals.  
• I meet new people with similar interests to me at festivals. |
| Known Group Socialisation (Reflective)      | • Festivals allow me to be with my friends.  
• I like to go to festivals with a friend group.  
• I like to spend quality time with my friend group at festivals.  
• Festivals allow me to spend quality time with my friend group.  
• Festivals allow our friend group to hang out together.  
• Festivals allow our friend group to get really close. |
| Social Capital (Reflective)                 | • Being able to share my festival experience on social media is important to me.  
• I enjoy showing others my festival experiences on social media.  
• Festival experiences give me more to talk about to my friends.  
• Social media is a great platform for sharing my festival experiences with my friends.  
• I like to get at least one great image of my festival experience to share on social media.  
• Capturing my festival experience for others to see is important to me. |
| Perceived Popularity (Reflective)           | • People in my friend group who go to festivals have more prestige than those who do not.  
• People in my friend group who go to festivals have a high profile.  
• Going to a festival is a status symbol in my friend group.  
• People in my friend group who go to festivals are more popular that those who do not go. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Flow (Formative)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Attendance (Formative)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Inhibition (Reflective)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Social Desirability Positive (Reflective)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Social Desirability Negative (Reflective)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Event Anticipation (Reflective)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Event Attractions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| People in my friend group who go to festivals are cooler than those who don’t go. | Flow Sub-construct: Mindful Perceptual (reflective)  
- My attention was focused entirely/exclusively on what I was doing at the festival.  
- I was not concerned with what others may have been thinking of me at the festival.  
- I felt in total control of what I was doing at the festival.  
- I did things more spontaneously at the festival than usual. | Attendance Sub-construct: Mindful Time (reflective)  
- Time seemed to alter (either slowed down or speeded up) at the festival.  
- The way time passed at the festival seemed to be different from normal. | Attendance  
- I am very much up for attending festivals.  
- Going to festivals makes me happy.  
- I am not put off attending festivals because of cost.  
- I am not put off attending festivals because of travel distance.  
- I am not put off attending festivals because of festival line-up.  
- I go to festivals mainly because I want to go myself.  
- I am not put off attending festivals because of my disposable income. | Inhibition  
- I am shy when I have to talk to an unfamiliar person.  
- I talk easily to an unfamiliar person.  
- I feel nervous when I have to talk to an unfamiliar person.  
- I feel good and I am able to laugh when I talk to an unfamiliar person. | Social Desirability Positive  
- I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.  
- I always try to practice what I preach.  
- I never resent being asked to return a favour.  
- I have never been annoyed when people expressed ideas very different from my own.  
- I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. | Social Desirability Negative  
- I like to gossip at times.  
- There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.  
- I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.  
- At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.  
- There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. | Event Anticipation  
- I look forward to attending festivals in the future.  
- I feel excited when I think about upcoming festivals.  
- I enjoy the lead up to festivals.  
- I like thinking about future festivals whilst I’m at a festival.  
- The lead up to a festival is an exciting time. | Event Attractions  
- I go to festivals to enjoy special events.  
- I go to festivals to see new and different things. |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items adapted from existing scale</th>
<th>Items newly developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Exploration</td>
<td>All items adapted from existing Cultural Exploration scale by Crompton and McKay (1997, p.433)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Socialisation</td>
<td>Two of the five items used were adapted from the “Socialization” scale by Uysal, Gahan and Martin (1993, p.7). One relevant item exists in the aforementioned scale: “To be with people who enjoy the same things as I do” (Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993, p.7) and two items were developed from that item. The two items are: 1. I meet new people with similar interests to me at festivals. 2. I meet new people who enjoy the same things as I do at festivals.</td>
<td>There were three newly developed items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Group Socialisation</td>
<td>Two items out of five were reworded from a scale for Known-Group Socialization used by Crompton and McKay (1997, p.443). These two items are:</td>
<td>Three newly developed items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.5 Development of Construct Items and Scales

Each construct within the model was measured using a series of items (see Table 3.6). These items were in the form of statements. Some of the items used to measure constructs emerged from previously validated scales from previous literature, which measured similar constructs. The items within these scales were then adapted into revised items to fit the constructs being measured in the current exploratory study. Where a similar previously tested scale did not exist, relevant items were chosen from existing scales related to the construct and additional items were developed in order to make up an adequate number of reflective statements to measure each construct, or a new set of items were developed to measure the construct. Table 3.7 indicates whether the scale measuring each construct was adapted and re-worded using an existing scale or newly developed for the purposes of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items adapted from existing scale</th>
<th>Items newly developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Exploration</td>
<td>All items adapted from existing Cultural Exploration scale by Crompton and McKay (1997, p.433)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Socialisation</td>
<td>Two of the five items used were adapted from the “Socialization” scale by Uysal, Gahan and Martin (1993, p.7). One relevant item exists in the aforementioned scale: “To be with people who enjoy the same things as I do” (Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993, p.7) and two items were developed from that item. The two items are: 1. I meet new people with similar interests to me at festivals. 2. I meet new people who enjoy the same things as I do at festivals.</td>
<td>There were three newly developed items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Group Socialisation</td>
<td>Two items out of five were reworded from a scale for Known-Group Socialization used by Crompton and McKay (1997, p.443). These two items are:</td>
<td>Three newly developed items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Festivals allow me to be with my friends.
2. I like to go to festivals with a friend group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Popularity</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition</td>
<td>This was originally a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 4. In the current study, a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 was used. All 4 items adapted from The Behavioural Inhibition Scale (BIS) (Gest, 1997 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.332; Muris et al., 1999 cited in Shatz, 2005, p. 332).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>All items adapted from Strahan and Gerbasi (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Attractions</td>
<td>All items adapted from an Event Attractions scale used in research by Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of pre-tests were conducted. The face validity technique, a review of the items with Generation Z, the Q-sort technique (Gaskin, 2016), or a combination of these techniques was employed to pre-test the items. Face validity is a method of testing scales which requires experts in the field to review the scales and to recommend if any items should be revised. The scales were reviewed by lecturers within Institute of Technology, Tralee, and were approved by same.

The initial items were reviewed by participants from Generation Z. Five participants reviewed the items and four of those participants also sorted the
items according to which construct each one belonged to. This is known as the Q-sort technique (Gaskin, 2016). The goal of the Q-sort is to reach a consensus among the Q-sort participants on how they matched the tested items with the constructs under measurement (Gaskin, 2016). The researcher explained to each participant in advance that the items would be subsequently included in a survey which would be completed by eighteen to twenty-three year olds. To review the items, participants were asked to let the researcher know if they had difficulty understanding any of the items they read, or if any re-wording was necessary, to increase the suitability of the items for people aged between eighteen and twenty-three years old. Each item was considered by these participants with this in mind. If the participant suggested any changes to items, these were noted. The participant then matched each item with the construct he or she believed it was associated with. The pre-tested items were revised where it was deemed necessary, having considered what had emerged during the review by Generation Z and the Q-sort technique.

After carrying out face validity, a review of the items with Generation Z, the Q-sort technique or a combination of these techniques initially, it was decided that an additional dependent variable would be included, namely ‘Event Anticipation’. The items used to measure this construct were reviewed via face validity. It was also decided that an additional control variable would be added. This was named ‘Event Attractions’ and was adapted from a scale measuring ‘Event Attractions’ used in research by Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004). All items were reviewed a final time via face validity before the pilot survey was carried out.

3.6.6 Survey Construction
Following a pre-test of the items using either face validity, a review of the items with Generation Z, the Q-sort technique (Gaskin, 2016) or a combination of these techniques, all of the scales were then transformed into an online survey built using Google Forms. This same platform was used by Meret et al. (2018?) to survey whom that research team qualified as Generation Z in 2016. This is an online survey development tool allowing users to create and send surveys to respondents via a link. The survey comprised of approximately 70 items that participants are required to respond to on a 5 point Likert Scale, ranging from
Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Croasmun and Ostrom (2011) suggest that an ideal number of options to select from within a Likert scale has not been agreed-upon among those who operate in the field of research. Leung’s (2011) paper also suggests that an ideal amount of options to select from for Likert scales has not been decided-upon. Leung (2011) suggests that research scales generally vary from having between four options and seven options, with certain scales having up to ten or eleven options to select from within the scale. The current study used a five-point Likert scale. A number of the current study’s construct items were adapted from existing scales (e.g., Crompton and McKay, 1997; Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993, Jackson and Marsh, 1996; Gest, 1997 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.332; Muris et al., 1999 cited in Shatz, 2005, p. 332; Strahan and Gerbasi, 1972 and Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004). The majority of the existing scales from which the current study’s items were adapted utilised five-point scales, from which respondents had to select one option (e.g., Crompton and McKay, 1997; Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993, Jackson and Marsh, 1996; and Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004). For this reason, it was considered suitable to also utilise a five-point Likert scale when asking participants to respond to construct items, as the majority of previous studies’ scales from which the current items were adapted had done. Dawes’ (2008) study involved respondents being asked eight questions by means of an interview over the phone. Each respondent was presented with either a five-point Likert scale, a seven-point Likert scale or a ten-point Likert scale to choose their response from. The study aimed to delineate the influence of the way the scale was set out (i.e., the number of points on the Likert scale) upon the data that emerged from it. In terms of mean score comparability, the five-point scales and seven-point scales were “re-scaled” (Dawes, 2008, p.7) and were not found to be significantly unlike each other. However, when these two scales were put into a comparison with the ten-point scale, it appeared that elevated scores in general emerged from the former two scales, compared with the latter (Dawes, 2008). Variance scores were not found to be influenced by whether the scale was five-point, seven-point or ten-point layout (Dawes, 2008). Significant disparities were found in relation to “the number of scale points used” by respondents to the questions, which depended on the number of points available to choose from in the scale (Dawes, 2008). Dawes (2008, p.8) found that if there are a higher number of “scale points”
available to choose from, respondents will choose from a higher number of different points. Significant differences between scales formats were not found in relation to skewness or kurtosis (Dawes, 2008).

### 3.6.7 Ethical Considerations

To carry out this research in an ethical manner, a number of considerations were reflected upon and a number measures were put in place. Firstly, due to the fact that those participating in this research were aged eighteen years old or above, parental consent was not needed from those who participated in the study. When completing the Consent Form which followed the Information Sheet in the self-administered online survey (see Appendix C), participants were required to confirm that they were aged eighteen years old or older. With regards to the collection stage of the quantitative data, upon clicking into the survey, participants were presented with an Information Sheet (see Appendix C) and Consent Form (see Appendix C) before responding to items within the self-administered online survey. Once the survey was completed, respondents were presented with a Debriefing Form (see Appendix C).

Participants were required to read an Information Sheet (see Appendix C) describing the research. The Information Sheet (see Appendix C) described the arrangements pertaining to the storage of the data collected. The Information Sheet also informed participants that anonymity and confidentiality, in relation to the data collected, would be maintained. Identifiable information such as participants’ names were not required to complete the online survey. The Information Sheet also asked that participants use an incognito window and to ensure that they are logged off from their Google accounts, including Gmail when completing the survey, to further ensure confidentiality. Finally, the Information Sheet specified that all researchers at the Institute of Technology Tralee are obliged to be GDPR compliant and have completed training in research ethics.

Participants were then required to respond to three statements within the Consent Form before continuing on to complete the Demographic Form and to respond to a series of items on a Likert Scale. Within the Consent Form, participants were required to give consent to a number of items. Firstly, each participant was asked to confirm that they read the Information Sheet and were
clear about what the study relates to. It secondly required each participant to confirm that they were aged 18 years old or over at the time of participation. Thirdly, it required participants to give consent to participate in the research, the results of which may be published.

The Debriefing Form followed which thanked participants for participating in the research. This form also explained the rights of the participant and the researcher’s name and contact details were at the bottom of this form for participants to take note of if wished to get in touch. None of the respondents were paid to participate in the research.

3.6.8 Piloting the online survey
A pilot study was carried out pre-distribution of the online survey to the public. The survey link was shared with thirteen pilot participants aged between eighteen and twenty-three years old. This was done to ensure the wording of the survey was suitable and to check if any revisions were required before the survey was publicised. A feedback box was included at the end of the pilot survey so that pilot participants had the opportunity to leave comments or suggestions for improvement for the researcher. Participants of the pilot study did not leave any comments or suggestions in the feedback box. Subsequent to the pilot study, a small number of items were revised slightly after conducting face validity with lecturers from Institute of Technology Tralee. A Cronbach’s Alpha was conducted on the data collected as part of the pilot study to ensure that the items used to measure each construct were fit for their purpose. Connelly (2011 cited in Adamson and Prion, 2013, p.e179) suggests that “Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) can range from 0.0 to 1.0, and it quantifies the degree to which items on an instrument are correlated with one another”. Cronbach’s Alpha for each reflective construct should be over 0.7. As a result of the Cronbach’s Alpha test, two items were revised slightly. The revisions were as follows:

1. Event Anticipation:
The results of the Cronbach’s Alpha test for the items within this construct was 0.667. It was decided to change item 4 within this scale slightly:
Original Item 4: I like making plans for future festivals even whilst I am at a festival.
Revised Item 4: I like thinking about future festivals whilst I am at a festival.
Following further face validity, this was changed to: I like thinking about future festivals whilst I’m at a festival.

2. Flow:
The Cronbach’s alpha result for this was .669, when tested using the data from the pilot study, this was changed slightly as follows in the finalised survey:
Original Item 6: I did things spontaneously and automatically at the festival without having to think.
Revised Item 6: I did things spontaneously at the festival.
Following further face validity, this was changed to: I did things more spontaneously at the festival than usual.

It was noted after the fact that these two constructs were in fact formative and the Cronbach’s alpha test wasn’t a relevant test here. Flow, Event Attractions and Attendance were the three constructs made up of formative statements/items in this study. The remainder of the constructs comprised reflective statements (see Table 3.6).

3.6.9 Procedure for quantitative data collection
Subsequent to the pilot study, a link to the finalised survey was made available publicly. The current study aimed to capture a representative sample of the population. Thus, the link to the survey was disseminated to Generation Z in a number of ways, including but not limited to, the following examples. For example, a dissemination email with information about the researcher and the study was sent to gatekeepers in a cross-section of educational institutions, such as third-level institutions (for example, IoTs) across Ireland, as well as further education colleges. These gatekeepers were asked to then distribute the link to the survey to students of their respective organisations, if it was permissible. The link to the survey was also available via a QR code on posters advertising the study. In addition, the link was shared with industry professionals and shared with festival organisations located in various parts of Ireland, who were asked to share it. These recipients were sent copy to use on social media as well as a graphic to advertise the survey on social media if they so wished. The link was
also shared by the researcher and the research supervisors on social media channels and/or networking sites as well as via messaging channels. It was intended that by sharing the survey link to organisations of different kinds based across the country, that a representative sample of the wider population Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland would be captured.

The survey (see Appendix C) comprised of an Information Sheet, a Consent Form, a Demographic Questionnaire and 70 items in the form of statements that participants were required to respond to on a Likert Scale, followed by a Debriefing Form. Respondents who participated were required to respond to each item in order to submit the survey. After participants read the Information Sheet, and completed the Consent Form, participants were required to fill out a Demographic Form indicating their age, gender, nationality, highest level of educational attainment, whether they were in part-time employment, full-time employment, unemployed and/or in full-time education at the time of the research. These responses were also required in order to move on to the next stage of the survey. The main survey followed, wherein the participants were required to respond to 70 items. Respondents indicated on a scale of 1 to 5 the degree (a Likert scale) to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Finally, at the end of the survey the respondents were presented with a Debriefing Form (see Appendix C).

The quantitative data collection took place from mid-May 2019 to late August 2019. There were 150 responses to the survey and 131 of these were subsequently deemed to be usable. 131 of the responses were analysed and the un-useable 19 were removed pre-analysis. The data gathered via the online survey was then extracted into a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet and analysed using the statistical package for social sciences SPSS, as well as AMOS and SMART PLS. AMOS is a statistical package that allows for the testing of structural equation modeling, while SMART PLS also allows for the testing of structural equation modelling.

3.6.10 Introduction to Structural Equation Modelling

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) is a method of measuring interdependence amid a set of constructs and of checking the associations between constructs (Morrison, Morrison and McCutcheon, 2017, p.1327), that were initially put
forward and anticipated (Morrison, Morrison and McCutcheon, 2017). It is suggested by Von der Embse (2016 cited in Morrison, Morrison and McCutcheon, 2017, p.1327) that conventional ways of analysing data are not able to check anticipated relations among variables in the same way that SEM can. It is proposed, for example, that when a researcher carries out an analysis utilising regression, the researcher must utilise a fragmented “approach to test interrelationships” (Morrison, Morrison and McCutcheon, 2017, p.1327), whilst such connections can be checked all at the same time using Structural Equation Modelling (Morrison, Morrison and McCutcheon, 2017). Structural Equation Modelling was used in this instance as a number of relationships between variables were being analysed. A visual model showing the connections between constructs is part of Structural Equation Modelling, this is described as a “schematic” (Van der Embse, 2016 cited in Morrison, Morrison and McCutcheon, 2017, p.1328). Lowry and Gaskin (2014) discuss “[f]irst-generation” and “second-generation” methods (Lowry and Gaskin, 2014, p.123). These are also known as “1G” and “2G” respectively (Lowry and Gaskin, 2014, p.123). First generation analyses include tests such as correlational tests and comparison tests such as “t-tests” (Lowry and Gaskin, 2014, p.123). Second generation analyses facilitate a wider scope of modelling (Lowry and Gaskin, 2014). This category of methods of analyses include Structural Equation Modelling (“co-variance based”) (Lowry and Gaskin, 2014, p.123). Second generation techniques do not replace first generation methods, essentially, the second generation methods have a wider scope of offering in terms of modelling (Lowry and Gaskin, 2014). To quote Lowry and Gaskin (2014, p.125), “One of the prime advantages of SEM is the ability to include latent (unobserved) variables in causal models. Thus, the researcher may model abstract constructs comprised of many indicators (observed variables), each of which is a reflection or a dimension of the latent construct. Another key advantage of SEM is that it enables the researcher to estimate complete causal networks simultaneously.”

3.7 Qualitative data collection
Following the collection and analysis of the quantitative data, the qualitative data collection stage, involving in-depth interviews with leaders in the festival sector or in the tourism industry, was undertaken between November 2019 and March
2020. The qualitative data collection was to be guided by the objectives of the research and findings of the quantitative data analysis and was to provide further insight into the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z in relation to festivals in Ireland. Bazeley (2013) suggests that a study using a qualitative approach will put emphasis on “observing, describing, interpreting and analysing the way that people experience, act on, or think about themselves and the world around them” (Bazeley, 2013, p.4). In the current research, at the qualitative interview stage, a pilot interview was also carried out, which helped the researcher to prepare for the main qualitative interviews to be conducted.

3.7.1 Sample 2: Festival and Tourism Stakeholders
The second sample in this research encompassed participants aged over 18 years old and who were leaders or professionals in the festival industry or tourism sector. Purposive sampling was used to select the sample for qualitative interviews. These participants were interviewed in order to gain the perspective of industry professionals on the motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. A purposive or non-randomised sample is used when research endeavours to gain knowledge about a topic, people or occurrences, as opposed to attempting to gain a greater understanding about a given population (Onwuegbuzie and Collins, 2007). According to Onwuegbuzie and Collins (2007, p.287), in this case, “the researcher purposefully selects individuals, groups, and settings for this phase that maximise understanding of the underlying phenomenon”. These interviews were undertaken in order to achieve deeper comprehension of the topic at hand. This sample was involved at the qualitative interview phase. Participants were both male and female.

3.7.2 Construction of the Interview Schedule
The aim of collecting qualitative data from the sample recruited was to further delve into the topic at hand. A series of questions were constructed which formed the Interview Schedules for the in-depth interviews (see Appendix I). More general questions relating to the topic were also included in the Interview Schedule. Separate schedules were developed for festival organisers and for those participants from tourism organisations. Semi-structured interviews were used.
3.7.3 Ethical Considerations

As per the quantitative data collection stage, to collect the qualitative data in an ethical manner, a number of considerations were also reflected upon and a number of measures were also put in place during the qualitative data collection stage.

As in the quantitative data collection phase, participants who participated in the qualitative data collection phase were aged over 18 years old, so parental consent was not needed from these participants. With regards to the qualitative data collection stage, participants were presented with an Information Sheet (see Appendix D), a Consent Form (see Appendix E) either in-person and/or via email, and a document with supplementary information about the study (see Appendix H) was read out to the interviewee before the interview began. The Consent Form (see Appendix E) was required to be returned to the researcher before the interview commenced, either by email or in-person.

Final participants were given an Information Sheet (see Appendix D). This gave details about the researcher and the research being undertaken as well as participants’ rights in relation to the research. Issues such as anonymity and confidentiality and the length of time for which participants’ data relating to the research would be kept were addressed also. Finally, the Information Sheet (see Appendix D) specified that all researchers at the Institute of Technology Tralee are obliged to be GDPR compliant and have completed training in research ethics. Within the Consent Form, participants were required to give ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answers to six assertions in relation to their consent to participate (see Appendix E). A ‘yes’ answer was required on all six assertions in order for a participant to be eligible to participate. As per the quantitative data stage, post-participation, a Debriefing Form (see Appendix F) was presented to each participant to re-iterate the participants’ rights and thanked each participant for participating in the research. Included at the bottom of this form were the researcher’s name and contact details for participants to take note of, if they wished to get in touch. Again, none of the interviewees at this stage were paid to participate in the research.
3.7.4 Procedure for qualitative data collection
To carry out the qualitative data collection, the researcher emailed individuals within the festival industry or tourism sector with a variation of the recruitment email (see Appendix G) which was tailored to them. The recruitment email (see Appendix H) invited these recipients to participate in the study. Another member of the research team who was already a contact of the potential participant made the initial contact in some cases. For those participants that indicated that they would be happy to participate, the researcher corresponded with the participant and arranged a time, date and venue in which to conduct the interviews. The researcher met with the participant and asked for the Consent Form (see Appendix E) to be filled in and signed if it had not been completed already. Once the Consent Form was completed and returned to the researcher if it had not been already, the participant read the document containing supplementary information about the study (see Appendix H) aloud, then turned on the recorder and indicated to the participant that the recording device(s) would now be turned on. The questions on the relevant Semi-Structured Interview Schedule (see Appendix I) were answered and any other topics that the participant felt were relevant were discussed. At the end of the interview, the recorder was turned off and the participant was thanked for contributing to the research. The researcher then presented each participant a Debriefing Form (see Appendix F) to keep.

The recordings were transcribed by the researcher. During transcription, all participants’ names were removed and instead they were named Participant 1, Participant 2 or Participant 3. Subsequently, other identifiable references were changed where necessary, e.g., if a participant made reference to the festival they are mainly associated with, this was changed to (specific festival). Further possible identifiers were removed from the transcripts, if the researcher felt that that this was necessary. Quotations from the transcripts were extracted and used as supporting or conflicting evidence for the quantitative findings and in some cases used on their own, to meet the objectives of the study.

3.8 Limitations regarding the methodology of the current study
There are a number of limitations associated with the methodology utilised in the current study. These will be outlined in the following paragraphs.
In the case of this study, the quantitative data collection was carried out across a period of just over three months. To recruit a larger number of participants, a greater timeframe would have been required. Given that the data collection was based on a sequential explanatory strategy, the quantitative data had to be collected and analysed before the qualitative data collection could commence. Given that the research study needed to be completed within approximately eighteen months, the timeframe given to the quantitative data collection could not be elongated, which limited the number of participants that were recruited. If the research project was not required to be completed within approximately eighteen months, a greater sample size may have been achieved at the quantitative data collection stage.

A second limitation existed in relation to the procedure of this study. During the quantitative data collection, it may have been useful to distribute hard copy surveys to eighteen to twenty-three year olds at community festivals, in addition to disseminating self-administered online surveys which required participants to respond retrospectively to reflective statements in relation to festivals these participants had attended in the past. When responding about experiences that have happened in the past, participants’ memories of their experiences may not be as clear as if they were if they were responding while being immersed in a festival experience at the time of completing the survey. It is suggested that it is harder to respond to questions that ask participants to think about bygone situations than present situations (Krosnick, 1991 cited in McKenzie and Podsakoff, 2012, p.547). It was decided not to distribute surveys at specific festivals as the presence of the researcher may have caused the responses of participants who completed the survey online and those who completed the survey in the presence of the researcher to be different. In addition, given the limited timeframe of the project, the researcher would not be able to attend a wide range of festivals. Distributing the survey via online channels and via message was deemed a more suitable course of action.

Thirdly, although this research began in 2018, and the eldest Generation Z members would have been twenty-three that year, the survey was disseminated in 2019 and thus Gen-Z festival goers in Ireland who were born in 1995, between January and when the survey closed, could potentially have participated, as they are Generation Z (born between 1995 and 2009) but would have been aged
twenty-four at that time. The survey asked for eighteen to twenty-three year olds only to participate, as in 2018, when the survey was being planned, only twenty-three year olds would have fallen into the Generation Z category, which was a slight flaw. One advantage of this is that there is a gap between the youngest Millennials and the sample Generation Z who did participate in the research, made up of those in the very earliest cohort of Generation Z who were born at the earliest point of 1995.

Fourthly, due to the fact that many educational institutions were contacted around exam time (from mid-May onwards) and in the lead up to the summer months, it may have been less likely that students would respond or look at their college emails. In addition, it may be a time of stress for students and they may have been too busy studying for exams when contacted to participate in the survey.

A final limitation is that the majority of the participants were attending third-level education and it would have been optimal to recruit an equal number of participants attending third-level and participants who were not attending third-level education or further education, and instead were in full-time employment, to allow for comparisons of these groups’ motivations and behaviours in relation to festivals in Ireland.

3.9 Conclusion
The purpose of this chapter is to clearly explain the methodology undertaken to answer the research questions pertaining to the current study, i.e., how the research was undertaken. The reasoning for choosing to utilise mixed methods is evident in this chapter. The research objectives, the epistemological perspective of the current study and the participating samples were described. Both the quantitative data collection stage and the qualitative data collection stages were described, as were ethical considerations pertaining to both. In the next chapter, the Findings chapter, results relating to both the quantitative and qualitative data collection will be presented. In the following chapter, the Discussion and Analysis chapter, the findings pertaining to each of the five objectives of the current study will be presented and discussed in the context of what has already been found in relation to these same findings. Given that there is limited existing literature about the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z in relation to
festivals in Ireland, some innovative findings will be identified. In addition, where further research may be of merit, such opportunities will be highlighted, as will practical findings for stakeholders within the festival industry.
Findings

4.1 Introduction

The findings of this research are presented in the following sections. The research question of the current study is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ Thus, the goal of the research is to identify the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. There is limited research focusing on the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z in Ireland, and this research area is greatly under-researched in the context of festivals. The current study intends to bridge what appears to be a gap in the literature in the field of festival motivation research. A number of research objectives were set out at the beginning of the research project to meet the overall goal of the research. The research objectives were identified in chapter 1 and chapter 3 and are re-stated in Table 4.1. The study’s quantitative findings are presented firstly. In section 4.6, these will then be presented, as will the qualitative findings, in light of each objective of the current study. Whilst there are a number of tables and figures within this chapter, supplementary tables and figures can also be found in the Appendices section of the current study. The reader will be directed to the Appendices section at different stages, where necessary, throughout this chapter.

Table 4.1 Research objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To determine the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>To evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how Generation Z festival-goers interact with festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>To appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers' level of attendance and participation at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers' behaviour at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To identify the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings are outlined as follows; Section 4.2 presents the descriptive statistics, including the sample size, the gender, age and nationality breakdowns.
of participants and the breakdown of the festival types that respondents kept in mind while completing the survey. Section 4.3 presents the mean scores for each construct. Section 4.4 introduces the significant findings related to group comparisons. Section 4.5 outlines the process involved in the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) inquiry. In Section 4.6, the findings related to each objective are presented. In section 4.7, the limitations pertaining to the research are outlined.

4.2 Descriptive statistics
In total, there were 150 responses to the survey. 19 responses were subsequently removed from the final dataset. There was one surplus response which was a test response entered by the researcher and this was also removed. Responses were removed for reasons including, but not limited to, participants being outside the required age bracket of 18-23 years old, participants not meeting the criteria in relation to the ‘trick’ items (these are items that checked whether respondents were engaged, e.g., ‘If you are still reading this, please tick ‘Strongly Disagree’), participants not selecting yes to statements in the consent form and so forth (see Appendix C).

4.2.1 Gender breakdown
131 participants were included in the final dataset. Figure 4.1 shows the gender breakdown of the responses that were included in the final dataset. Females (n=87) made up 66% of the final sample, while males (n=44) made up 34% of the final sample.
Figure 4.1 Gender breakdown by percentage

4.2.2 Age breakdown
The age breakdown of participants included in the final sample is outlined in Figure 4.2. Of the 131 participants, seven were aged 18, twenty-three were aged 19, twenty-five were aged 20, thirty-five were aged 21, twenty-one were aged 22 and twenty were aged 23.

Figure 4.2 Age breakdown of participants included in the final dataset
4.2.3 Nationality

The nationality of participants was captured in the survey, with the majority of participants identifying as Irish (n=116). The nationality breakdown of participants included in the final dataset is shown in Figure 4.3. Other nationalities included Polish (n=4), Malaysian (n=3), English (n=2), Dutch but born in Ireland (n=1), Filipino (n=1), Irish/German (n=1), Lithuanian (n=1), Pakistani (n=1), Thai/Irish (n=1). Figure 4.3 presents a breakdown of the nationality of the Generation Z participants who responded to the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai/Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish/German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch but born in Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Nationality breakdown of participants included in the final dataset](image)

4.2.4 Breakdown of festival type specified

Participants who completed the survey were asked to think about the last festival they went to, or the festival from which they have the most vivid memories. They were also asked to respond to the statements to follow with the specific festival they attended in mind. Participants were encouraged to think of any type of festival by being given a range of different types of festival examples (see Appendix C). Participants were then asked to specify the festival they would keep in mind when answering the following questions. Subsequently, the
festivals specified were categorised by the researcher into the following categories, outlined in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2 Festival type specified categories**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Music festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Home-grown festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tourist-tempter festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Big-bang festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Music Festivals were the most frequently referenced category (n=79), taking into account festivals such as *Electric Picnic, Body and Soul, Sziget, Forbidden Fruit, Indiependence* and so forth. A festival typology set out by O’Sullivan and Jackson (2002, cited in Skoultzos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) was used to categorise some of the remaining festivals. Music festivals were one category and this typology by O’Sullivan and Jackson (2002 cited in Skoultzos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) was used to categorise the remaining festivals, and ‘other’ was used to categorise those that were not categorisable. There appears to be a lack of festival typologies in existence and it may be that a more suitable typology for Generation Z would be worth developing. O’Sullivan and Jackson (2002 cited in Skoultzos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) identify three festival types, including a “home-grown” festival, a “tourist-tempter” festival and a “big-bang” festival (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultzos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302). Although the festivals referred to by respondents didn’t all fit exactly into a category, they were categorised as was seen as the best fit by the researcher.

The breakdown of festival type is presented in Figure 4.4. The festivals categorised as ‘other’ were those which couldn’t be categorised by the researcher for various reasons. “[T]ourist-tempter” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultzos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) festivals were the second most frequently referred to (n=25), followed by festivals in the category of ‘other’ (n=18), “home-grown” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultzos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) festivals (n=7) and lastly, “big-bang” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultzos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) festivals (n=2).
4.3 Construct means

The mean of each construct measured in the study (including the independent variables, the mediator variables, the dependent variables, one of the moderators (Inhibition) and one of the control variables (Event Attractions)), as set out in the proposed Structural Equation Model (Figure 3.1) in chapter 3 (the methodology chapter), was calculated to indicate the Generation Z sample of respondents’ scores, as a whole, on the various constructs. O’Shea (2013) contends that ordinal data results from a variable whereby a measure of same is taken from one sole item. Boone and Boone (2012, n.p.) suggest that “Likert scale data…are analyzed at the interval measurement scale. Likert scale items are created by calculating a composite score (sum or mean) from four or more type Likert-type items; therefore, the composite score for Likert scales should be analyzed at the interval measurement scale”. Boone and Boone (2012, n.p.) propose that the “descriptive statistics” that should be utilised when analysing this form of data “include the mean for central tendency”. It must be noted that the below analyses were carried out using constructs which were not validated and then at a later stage, the SEM model stage, these constructs were validated. Thus, the results
below relate to constructs which were not validated. The mean of each construct for this sample is outlined in Table 4.3 below. As in the survey, 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree, therefore, the higher the score below, the higher the mean score is for that construct. The constructs’ means have been listed in order, from highest to lowest.

Table 4.3 Construct means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known Group Socialisation</td>
<td>4.4873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Attractions</td>
<td>4.3695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Exploration</td>
<td>4.0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>3.9679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>3.9326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Socialisation</td>
<td>3.8183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>3.5932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>3.5891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition</td>
<td>2.7538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Popularity</td>
<td>2.0901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Group comparisons

In terms of comparing groups, two different group comparisons were carried out. The first comparison was between males (n=44) and females (n=87). The second comparison compared those aged from 18 to 20 years old (n=55) (young) and 21 to 23 years old (n=76) (old). To compare the latter, a recode into different variables was carried out. Old and new values were set out as follows: 18 thru 20 = 1 and 21 thru 23 = 2.

4.4.1 Test carried out prior to the group comparison analyses

Before comparing groups, tests of normality were carried out to decipher which test to run to compare the groups. To use the independent samples t-test, the assumption of normality must be met i.e., the significance level for the appropriate test of normality must exceed .05, otherwise, the Mann-Whitney U test will be selected. Since the sample size for males fell below 50, the Shapiro-
Wilks test of normality was used. These analyses were carried out using constructs which were not validated and then at a later stage, the SEM model stage, these constructs were validated. Therefore, the results relate to constructs which have not been validated. There were no significant differences when comparing the young category (those aged 18 to 20) of early Generation Z and the older category (those aged 21 to 23) of Generation Z on the various constructs.

4.4.2 Significant findings relating to group comparisons

Group comparisons based on gender were carried out on each construct. These analyses were carried out using constructs which were not validated and then at a later stage, the SEM model stage, these constructs were validated. Therefore, the results relate to constructs which were not validated. As the Shapiro Wilks test for the male sample was above 0.05, but the for the female sample, it was below 0.05, a Mann-Whitney U test was run to establish if there were differences in the Social Capital scores between males and females. The only construct exhibiting significant differences between males and females was Social Capital. Distributions of the Social Capital scores for females and males were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Social Capital scores for males (mean rank = 53.93) and females (mean rank = 72.10) were statistically significantly different, U = 1383, z = -2.593, p = .010.

4.5 Structural Equation Modelling/SEM order of operations

4.5.1. Case and variable screening

The following order of operations follows the development of the proposed SEM model above. This order of operations begins with the process of data cleansing/screening which is a prerequisite to effective statistical analysis. Data screening ensures that the data is useable, reliable and valid, prior to employing SEM estimation.

4.5.1.1 Data Screening

Missing Data:
There was no missing data in the dataset.
Outliers:
The variables relating to the latent constructs were measured using a 5-point Likert response set. Thus, the observance of outliers was not relevant in those instances. No outliers were present for the Age variable.

Normality
O’Shea (2013, p.125) writes that if data is not normal, then “any attempts at interpretation or deriving inferences from parametric statistical tests” may be considered to be “unreliable or invalid”. This is due to statistical tests making the assumption that population data is normal (O’Shea, 2013). The variables relating to the latent constructs were assessed for normality using tests for skewness and kurtosis. Variables with values outside the range ± 2.2 for both skewness and kurtosis were flagged for assessment. Consequently, there were no skewness issues and just two minor kurtosis breaches;

1. Festivals allow me to spend quality time with my friend group. (kurtosis = 2.399)
2. I go to festivals to enjoy a unique atmosphere. (kurtosis = 2.642)

4.5.1.2 Multivariate Data Screening

Linearity
Gaskin (2016, n.p.) suggests that linearity is “the consistent slope of change that represents the relationship between an IV and a DV. If the relationship between the IV and the DV is radically inconsistent, then it will throw off your SEM analyses”. A curve estimation for each of the proposed direct relationships in the model determined that the majority of such relationships were sufficiently linear (i.e., P < .05), to facilitate testing with a covariance based structural equation modelling (SEM) algorithm such as the one employed in AMOS. However, the following relationships do not meet the linearity criterion, Cultural Exploration and Social Capital, Perceived Popularity and Attendance, Perceived Popularity and Event Anticipation. These non-linear relationships present a limitation in the context of employing AMOS which estimates linear relationships.
Homoscedasticity
Homoscedasticity implies that a given “variable's residual (error) exhibits consistent variance across different levels of the variable” (Gaskin, 2016, n.p.). There were no problematic issues revealed in the tests for homoscedasticity (i.e., Scatterplot of Dependent on zResid).

Multicollinearity
Multicollinearity occurs when variance in a dependent variable is accounted for by independent variables within a study, but the variance accounted for by independent variables is not completely separate, it is intersecting, and thus, a given amount of variance accounted for in a dependent variable does not apply to only one given independent variable (Gaskin, 2016). The Variable Inflation Factor (VIF) was tested in instances where more than two variables, at the same level in the proposed SEM model, were being proposed to predict another variable. All the VIFs were below 2.0 which suggests that each proposed predictor is distinct.

4.5.2 Validating Latent Constructs – Measurement Model
Prior to estimating the proposed SEM model, each of the constructs included in the model require validation. Reflective latent constructs were validated using both an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA utilising IBM SPSS) and a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA utilising IBM Amos). The validation process for formative constructs embraces procedures in stark contrast to the validation of reflective constructs. Formative latent constructs were validated using Smart PLS 3 software. A proxy approach for determining convergent validity is to produce indicator or formative construct item weights and assess whether these weights have approximate equality along with statistically significant t-values for each indicator. In addition, an assessment for the validation of formative constructs must include a test for multicollinearity.

4.5.3 Validating Reflective Latent Constructs
4.5.3.1 Step 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis
Exploratory Factor Analysis facilitates identifying “correlation” between a number of different “variables in a dataset”, statistically (Gaskin, 2016, n.p.). An EFA was carried out using Principle Axis Factoring with Promax rotation to assess the planned and predicted factor structure.

4.5.3.2 Adequacy
The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (0.726) was statistically significant at the 0.001 level of significance. Therefore, the dataset was deemed adequate for the application of factor analysis with the intent that the data be grouped into a reduced number of underlying factors.

All extracted communalities, excluding the specific bias variable, exceeded 0.4. A substantial 85% of indicators, excluding the specific bias indicators, exceeded 0.5. The lowest extracted communalities, relating to five of the eight remaining Social Desirability items, ranged from 0.234 to 0.377. The reproduced correlation matrix revealed 9% non-redundant residuals with absolute values > 0.05.

4.5.3.3 Reliability
Gaskin (2016, n.p.) posits that “a "reliable" set of variables will consistently load on the same factor”. Table 4.4 (see Appendix J) presents the Cronbach’s alpha values for the resultant extracted reflective factors. All Cronbach’s alpha values exceed 0.7. All indicators included in the EFA are reflective and those indicators representing each proposed and predicted factor are at least moderately correlated.

4.5.3.4 Validity
Convergent validity implies that in relation to a given factor, correlation exists to a great extent between the variables that are part of that factor (Gaskin, 2016). The extracted reflective factors, apart from the specific bias factors, achieved required an adequate convergent validity, each with an average loading value of at least 0.7, apart from Cultural Exploration (0.688). The loadings for indicators representing each respective latent factor exceed the recommended minimum threshold of 0.5 for a sample size of 120 (Hair et al., 2010). In addition,
discriminant validity relates to factors being separate from each other, that is, “the extent to which factors are distinct and uncorrelated” (Gaskin, 2016, n.p.). The extracted factors achieved required and adequate discriminant validity as reflected in the factor correlation matrix. The factor correlation matrix shows that there are no correlations exceeding 0.7. The EFA did not reveal problematic cross-loadings. The pattern matrix is presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>KGS</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>ExS</th>
<th>INH</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>EvAnt</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>SD-3</th>
<th>SD+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Load2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KGS3</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KGS4</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KGS5</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KGS2</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KGS1</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KGS6</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP2</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP4</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP1</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP5</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ExS4</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ExS5</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ExS1</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ExS2</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN1</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN2</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN3</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN4</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC6</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC5</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EvAnt2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EvAnt1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

119
This nine-factor model has a total variance explained slightly in excess of 60%. Each of the extracted factors have an eigenvalue in excess of 1.0.

4.5.3.5 Step 2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

4.5.3.6 Validity and Reliability

1. Discriminant validity was assessed and deemed achieved for each factor using the following criteria:

   a. Maximum Variance Shared (MSV) < Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

   b. The square root of the AVE is greater than any other correlation with any other factor

   c. Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT) < 0.85

See Table 4.6 Validity Analysis in Appendix K.

See Table 4.7 HTMT Analysis in Appendix L.
2. Convergent validity was assessed using the AVE (Average Variance Extracted). The AVE exceeded 0.50 for each factor with the exception of Cultural Exploration (AVE = 0.477). However, since Cultural Exploration has trivial to low correlation with all the extracted reflective factors in the proposed model and has a composite reliability score (CR = 0.782) in excess of 0.700, the decision was made to retain this factor in the model. In any event, Malhotra and Dash (2011) was drawn upon to support this decision, “AVE is a more conservative measure than CR. On the basis of CR alone, the researcher may conclude that the convergent validity of the construct is adequate, even though more than 50% of the variance is due to error.” (Malhotra and Dash, 2011, p.702).

3. Factor reliability for each factor was tested using the composite reliability (CR) score. The CR score exceeded the minimum threshold (0.07) for each latent factor.

4.5.3.7 Model Fit
Gaskin (2016, n.p.) puts forward a description of model fit as follows: “Model fit refers to how well our proposed model…accounts for the correlations between variables in the dataset”. The following two indicators were removed from the initial measurement model, after consulting modification indices, with the intention of improving model fit:

1. I hang out with new people at festivals. (External Socialisation)
2. I look forward to attending festivals in the future (Event Anticipation)

The measurement model achieved at least acceptable model fit as indicated in Table 4.8 (see Appendix M). See Figure 4.5 Measurement Model (Reflective Latent Constructs) in Appendix N.

4.5.4 Validating Formative Latent Constructs
The validation of formative constructs will incorporate both a test of indicator multicollinearity for each construct and an assessment of the level of significance
of each indicator path leading to each formative construct. The formative constructs in the proposed SEM model include:

1. Flow which is a first-order formative construct comprising the following indicators:
   a. I was not concerned with what others may have been thinking of me at the festival.
   b. The way time passed at the festival seemed to be different from normal.
   c. I did things more spontaneously at the festival than usual.

2. Attendance which is a second-order formative construct which has a reflective first order, and includes the following items:
   - **Attendance Fun – Reflective First-Order**
     a. I am very much up for attending festivals.
     b. Going to festivals makes me happy.
   - **Attendance Despite – Reflective First-Order**
     c. I am not put off attending festivals because of cost.
     d. I am not put off attending festivals because of travel distance.
     e. I am not put off attending festivals because of festival line-up.

3. Event Attractions which is a second-order formative construct which has a reflective first order, and includes the following items:
   - **Event Attractions Special – Reflective First-Order**
     a. I go to festivals to enjoy special events.
     b. I go to festivals to see new and different things.
   - **Event Attractions Mood – Reflective First-Order**
     c. I go to festivals to enjoy the festival mood.
     d. I go to festivals to enjoy a unique atmosphere.
     e. I attend festivals that sound like fun.

A liberal cut-off point to declare that there are no multicollinearity issues might employ a $VIF(\beta_i)$ below 10 (Hair et al., 1995). Others suggest a more cautious cut-off point for the $VIF(\beta_i)$ of below 3.3 (Kock and Lynn, 2012). There were no problematic multicollinearity issues detected with just a few indicators presenting mild multicollinearity concerns:
1. I am very much up for attending festivals, $VIF = 3.760$
2. Going to festivals makes me happy, $VIF = 3.906$

Each of the indicator paths leading to the formative constructs had statistically significant $t$-statistics after employing the PLS bootstrapping procedure with 5000 subsamples with parallel processing. The path coefficient signs were all positive as was theoretically hypothesised and each path coefficient had well exceeded the minimum desirable weights threshold of 0.1. See Figure 4.6 ‘Measurement Model (Formative Latent Constructs)’ in Appendix O and see Figure 4.7 ‘Measurement Model (Formative Latent Constructs - Weights and Loadings)’ in Appendix P.

### 4.5.5 Response Bias – Specific or common bias

Since the data relating to both the independent and dependent variables were collected using the same quantitative instrument and at the same time point, and since both the Independent Variables and Dependent Variables are of a latent perceptual nature, then it is essential to assess whether there is common bias present in the data. Assuming that specific bias has not been avoided, then it must be accounted for in order to avoid potential false positives when presenting statistically significant effects. The specific bias variable selected is the Social Desirability variable. The inclusion of this variable will ensure that any attempt by respondents to answer in a socially desirable way is accounted for in the proposed SEM model.

A method bias test with a common latent factor (the CLF only pulls out the shared variance amongst all items. If there is variance shared between the Social Desirability variance and the variance of other constructs, then that is the bias that is intended for extraction) made the model unstable. Instead, the Social Desirability constructs were used to assess whether bias is present. In conclusion, no measurable bias was detected. The null hypothesis which states that the constrained and unconstrained model are the same cannot be rejected. Social desirability is not impacting the proposed model.
With the specific bias markers included in the model, both model fit and the validity and reliability of the constructs were deemed to have met established criteria having invoked findings by Malhotra and Dash (2011) “AVE is a more conservative measure than CR. On the basis of CR alone, the researcher may conclude that the convergent validity of the construct is adequate, even though more than 50% of the variance is due to error.” (Malhotra and Dash, 2011, p.702). See Table 4.10 Validity Analysis including the specific bias markers (see Appendix Q). See Table 4.11 HTMT Analysis including the specific bias markers (see Appendix R).

### 4.5.5.1 Model Fit Analysis including the specific bias markers

#### Table 4.12 Model Fit Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN</td>
<td>842.057</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>610.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>Between 1 and 3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>&gt;0.95</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>&lt;0.06</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PClose</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In conclusion, factor scores for each of the latent constructs, adjusted for any potential bias being parcelled out by social desirability i.e., the extent to which social desirability was impacting the constructs has been adjusted for in the new factor scores. Figure 4.8 Measurement Model Common Latent Factor – Specific Bias extraction is presented in Appendix S.
4.5.6 Structural Model Estimation

Each of the proposed hypotheses were examined whilst controlling for Event Attractions. It was presumed that Event Attractions most likely impacts Event Anticipation and Attendance and is therefore, not a prior hypothesised effect in the proposed SEM model. The SEM model was estimated without the presence of the interaction variable (moderator), Inhibition. The decision was made to exclude multi-group moderation analysis since minimum sample size requirements *per group* were not met. In order to proceed and test the proposed set of hypotheses, it was necessary to establish adequate model fit. In order to achieve adequate model fit i.e., to avoid an invalid model, it was necessary to modify the SEM model as follows:

1. It was necessary to account for or control for the effect of Known Group Socialisation on Event Anticipation.
2. It was necessary to control for the effect of Event Attractions on Flow.
3. It was necessary to control for the effect of Event Anticipation on Attendance.
4. It was necessary to control for the effect of External Socialisation on Event Anticipation.
5. The endogenous mediator Flow was originally located as a dependent outcome variable and was repositioned to achieve model fit as long as it made logical theoretical sense.

The following SEM model provided adequate model fit.
Figure 4.9 Structural Equation Model

Table 4.13 Model Fit Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Threshold(^1)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN</td>
<td>10.999</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>Between 1 and 3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>&gt;0.95</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>&lt;0.06</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PClose</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


An assessment of model strength is observed with reference to the total variance explained \((R^2)\) by the model for the primary dependent variables. The model estimates an \(R^2 = 50\%\) for Event Anticipation and an \(R^2 = 45\%\) for Attendance.

The model explains 45\% of the variance in Attendance with particular reference to the following combination of statistically significant predictor variables: Flow, Event Anticipation and Event Attractions. The model explains 50\% of the variance in Event Anticipation with equal reference and small
magnitude to the following statistically significant predictors, Social Capital, Perceived Popularity, Flow, Known Group Socialisation, External Socialisation and Event Attractions. The SEM model explains 38% of the variance in endogenous mediator, Flow, with equal reference and medium magnitude to External Socialisation and Event Attractions.

The other proposed predictors of Flow namely, Cultural Exploration and Known Group Socialisation, revealed an approximate zero prediction value. The model demonstrated no predictive value for the endogenous mediators, Perceived Popularity and Social Capital, each with an R-square of 2% and 7% respectively. Therefore, although Known Group Socialisation presents as a significant predictor for Social Capital, this finding ought to be downgraded in the context of the minor variance explained for Social Capital in this model.

The control variable Event Attractions did have a significant impact on the primary dependent variables Attendance and Event Anticipation along with the endogenous mediator Flow. Event Attractions was logically presumed to positively impact the proposed dependent variables at the pre-study phase and was included as a control in order to explore whether other proposed predictors might impact the proposed dependent variables despite the presence of the control variable. Table 4.14 presents the predictor (Event Attractions) and outcome variables.

### Table 4.14 Predictor and Outcome variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Standardised Direct Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Event Attractions</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Event Attractions</td>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Event Attractions</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Correlations:
† p < 0.100
* p < 0.050
** p < 0.010
*** p < 0.001

### 4.5.7 Hypotheses Testing

The initial proposed model, as depicted in chapter 3, is presented in Figure 4.10.
4.5.7.1 Direct Effects

Table 4.15 lists the statistically significant direct effects along with a corresponding magnitude of effect for each direct effect, whilst controlling for Event Attractions. External Socialisation has a positive effect on Flow \((p < .001)\) and this effect is of medium magnitude \((f^2 = .2097)\). Effect size reflects the magnitude of a statistically significant effect. A statistically significant effect which has a zero to trivial \((f^2 < .02)\) magnitude of effect can arguably be disregarded in social science research. A statistically significant effect which has at least a small \((f^2 \geq .02)\) magnitude of effect is assumed to make some relevant contribution to explaining the variance in the dependent variable. See Table 4.15 which presents a Summary of Findings – Direct Effects (see Appendix T).

4.5.7.2 Mediation – Simple and Serial Mediation

Mediation was explored using Hayes’ (2009) method of bias-corrected bootstrapping for mediation (applying 2000 bootstrap samples). The mediation process employed bootstrapped specific indirect effects in order to identify unique indirect effects for every possible mediation, reflecting the exploratory nature of this research. Mediation is the proposed reason for a proposed
association between an exogenous variable (IV) and an endogenous variable (DV). If, for example, a proposed hypothesis suggests that Flow mediates the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Event Anticipation, then our conclusion is that this hypothesis is supported at the 0.05 level of significance ($p = 0.024$). See Table 4.16 which presents the statistically significant mediated effects (see Appendix U).

4.5.7.3 Moderation – Interaction
The positive direct relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation was considered for varying degrees of inhibition. The SEM model showed that an assessment of the interaction of Inhibition on the relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation revealed that Inhibition strengthens the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation. This suggests that at higher levels of inhibition, the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation is amplified or strengthened. Model fit criteria was met for the interaction test. Table 4.17 presents the Summary of Findings - Interaction Effects (see Appendix V). See Figure 4.11 Moderation - Interaction (Appendix W).

Figure 4.12 Interaction Effects

\[
y = 0.356x + 2.433 \\
y = -0.02x + 3.063
\]
4.6 Findings reported in light of research objectives

The current study’s overall goal is to identify the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Thus, the research question is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ There appears to be a gap in the existing literature on this specific area which the current research intended to bridge. To answer this research question, a number of objectives were set out. By meeting these objectives, it was intended that the overall goal of the current research would be achieved. The following section will outline the quantitative and qualitative findings relating to each objective set out for this study. In the structural equation modelling stage, the constructs were validated and some items were removed. For this reason, the constructs and their remaining items as well as their operational definitions in relation to this study are listed in Table 4.18 (see Appendix X).

Table 4.19 Research objectives

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To determine the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how Generation Z festival-goers interact with festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers' level of attendance and participation at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers' behaviour at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To identify the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 Objective 1: To determine the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

The first objective was to determine the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. It was intended that by meeting this objective, motivations of Generation Z festival-goers would be apparent. These results would then contribute to answering the research question of the current study, which is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ To present the results relating to the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in
Ireland, the findings relating to both the Attendance and Event Anticipation constructs will be discussed. Please note that some of the qualitative interview extracts have been edited to ensure interviewees’ confidentiality is maintained. For example, (specific band) refers to a band whose name has been removed. Another example relates to the fact that some festival names have been replaced with (specific festival) in some areas, given their association with the interviewees. There are several examples of these replacements in the following sections. These are not errors; instead the names have been replaced for confidentiality reasons.

4.6.1.1 Variance explained by the Structural Equation Model (SEM)

a). Attendance
The proposed SEM model explains 45% of the variance in Attendance with particular reference to the following combinations of statistically significant predictor variables: Flow, Event Attractiveness and Event Anticipation. Each of these three predictors demonstrated an almost equal moderate magnitude impact on Attendance. This means that these constructs together have explained 45% of the variance in Attendance. The other proposed predictors of Attendance, namely Perceived Popularity and Social Capital, revealed an approximate zero prediction effect. The independent variables that explain a given amount of variance in Attendance are of significant importance, and they contribute to explaining why Generation Z festival-goers attend festivals.

b). Event Anticipation
The model explains 50% of the variance in Event Anticipation with equal reference and magnitude to the following statistically significant predictors, Event Attractiveness, Known Group Socialisation, Social Capital, External Socialisation, Flow and to a lesser extent, Perceived Popularity. This means that these constructs together have explained 50% of the variance in Event Anticipation. The independent variables that explain a given amount of variance in Event Anticipation are of significant importance, and they contribute to explaining why Generation Z festival-goers look forward to festivals.
4.6.1.2 Findings in relation to the festival type specified
Generation Z participants were asked to keep a specific festival in mind, that they last attended, or from which they had the most vivid memories. The majority of the sample in this study kept music festivals in mind (n=79), when asked to specify the festival they would keep in mind when answering the survey.

4.6.1.3 Findings in relation to Attendance and Event Anticipation
4.6.1.3.1 Direct Effects: Attendance
A direct effect, stated in the alternative hypothesis format, sets out to ascertain whether an independent variable (IV) impacts, or positively or negatively effects, a dependent variable (DV). The following paragraphs will identify the variables that had a direct effect upon Attendance. These variables are of note as they contribute to explaining why Generation Z festival-goers attend festivals, or, in other words, what motivates them to go to festivals, thus contributing to answering the research question of the current study.

a). Flow -> Attendance
The most important relationship that emerged in the direct effect findings relating to Attendance was that of the impact of Flow on Attendance. The effect size is small. This is of significance and was backed up by qualitative findings also. For example, Participant 1, when discussing Flow, commented that:

“I think to me that’s the main reason people go to festivals and like again I think they want to hear the music, they want to see the bands, but like I think it’s become secondary to just leaving your inhibitions at the gate and it’s just having three days of like yeah” – Participant 1

The significance of experiencing Flow for Generation Z was also emphasised by Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser. Participant 3 was asked to what extent do they think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to experience Flow and Participant 3 replied:

“ahh yeah they definitely do like when they when they’re in that like zone with their music or you know and it can be a band or it can be a DJ emm or even in a (specific experience) experience where they’re just floating and they’re just doing something and they come out and go “wow that was amazing” you know they’re definitely living their best life you know they’re it’s,
it is something that ah feeds them I think it feeds something in all of us, there’s an emotional connection…” – Participant 3

b). Event Anticipation -> Attendance
Event Anticipation was found to have a direct impact on Attendance in the current study. Event Anticipation was also found, along with two other constructs in this study (Event Attractions and Flow) to explain 45% of the variance in Attendance. Although this relationship wasn’t discussed in the qualitative interviews, it could be said that it would be expected that the more an attendee looks forward to an experience, the more likely they are to attend same. Further research is necessary to investigate this suggestion to see if it is supported.

c). Event Attractions -> Attendance
In addition, Event Attractions was found to have a small direct effect on Attendance. Event Attractions was included in the current study as a control variable, meaning that it was expected to have an effect on the dependent variables and this influence was controlled for. Event Attractions was found, along with two other variables, to account for 45% of the variance in Attendance. Within the qualitative interviews, the event attractions of festivals, interpreted to be the festival content by the researcher, is discussed as a motive for attendance among Generation Z. Interestingly, the opportunity to socialise with friends has been discussed by both Participant 1 and Participant 3, and this may need to be considered as an event attraction, in the same way as the festival content. When asked what do you think are the key factors that motivate Generation Z to attend festivals, Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser said:

“…drink, drink’s a big part of it, socially they want to to meet their friends and it’s a really good thing to do that isn’t in a pub…you know I think you’re limited between the ages of 18 to 24 to find anywhere that isn’t the pub. Now they’re pretty good at doing you know you know eh (extract removed for confidentiality reasons) and things like that which is always really interesting but I think they come for the cert-, so they come for the music definitely, they come for the art in some way shape or form, they come for whatever cultural events, but I think they come to meet people. We would often see particularly in that category people who that’s why it’s at weekends you know they’re home from college potentially amm and it’s ah, a reunion actually…of friends that they may not have seen for a while…” – Participant 3
When asked to what extent do you believe that Generation Z festival-goers attend festivals to strengthen their relationships with their current friends, Participant 1 replied:

“yeah I think it’s it’s that thing you know like of they want to go and and have that different experience...where they can literally leave their inhibitions at the gate...you know with their mates and you know like if it means you know a lad dressing or a girl dressing how they wouldn’t normally dress...or or just being a bit free-er on the weekend and that seems that to me what festivals are about...it’s that you know 2/3 days where you’re just completely free and you go and enjoy it, the music but also you know a few beers, the laughs, hanging out with your friends” – Participant 1

This participant was being asked about Known Group Socialisation as a motive in this case, but replied with a more general synopsis of why Generation Z attend festivals, commenting that having a different experience including experiencing freedom, being able to be uninhibited, enjoying the music, beers, laughs and socialising with friends are:

“what festivals are about” – Participant 1

4.6.1.3.2 Indirect Effects: Attendance

A mediated effect, stated in the alternative hypothesis format sets out to ascertain whether a proposed mediated variable mediates or contributes an explanation to the relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable. In terms of indirect effects, a number of mediating effects were shown to exist. The results reported in the following paragraphs will contribute to explaining different variables’ relationships with the construct ‘Attendance’. Therefore, if a given variable is found to have a relationship with Attendance, the mediators of this relationship will be presented. These results are of note as they contribute to explaining why Generation Z festival-goers go to festivals and thus, contribute to the overall identification of motives of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

a). External Socialisation -> Flow -> Attendance

Significantly, it was shown that Flow mediates the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. This finding means that External Socialisation impacts upon Flow, which then impacts on Attendance, therefore Flow contributes to explaining why External Socialisation impacts Attendance.
This relationship was not specifically investigated in the qualitative interviews, however, the relationship between External Socialisation and Flow (External Socialisation was found to have a direct effect on Flow, which is medium in effect size) will be outlined in section 4.6.3.2.1. In a similar way, the relationship between Flow and Attendance (Flow was found to have a direct effect upon Attendance, which is small in effect size) was outlined in section 4.6.1.3.1(a). Further research would be warranted to further decipher what festival organisers can glean from this finding in order to increase Attendance levels among Generation Z festival-goers.

b). Event Attractions -> Flow -> Attendance

Flow was also found to mediate the relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. This means that Event Attractions impacts upon Flow, which in turn impacts upon Attendance, thus Flow contributes to explaining why Event Attractions impacts upon Attendance. Event Attractions having such an effect was expected as it was originally included as a control variable. That Event Attractions has an impact on Flow is supported by qualitative findings. Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser, as before, discusses how festival-goers can enjoy “…that different experience…” (Participant 1) which is an experience made up of a number of aspects, where they can have a weekend of complete freedom and enjoyment, both of which are aspects of Jackson and Marsh’s (1996, p.18) definition of Flow, as follows “[w]hen in flow, a person becomes totally involved in an activity and experiences a number of positive experiential characteristics, including freedom from self-consciousness and great enjoyment of the process”.

“yeah I think it’s it’s that thing you know like of they want to go and and have that different experience...where they can literally leave their inhibitions at the gate...you know with their mates and you know like if it means you know a lad dressing or a girl dressing how they wouldn’t normally dress...or just being a bit free-er on the weekend and that seems that to me what festivals are about...it’s that you know 2/3 days where you’re just completely free and you go and enjoy it, the music but also you know a few beers, the laughs, hanging out with your friends...” – Participant 1

The impact of Flow on Attendance has already been discussed in section 4.6.1.3.1 (a).
c). Event Attractions \rightarrow Event Anticipation \rightarrow Attendance

Another significant indirect effect is that of Event Anticipation mediating the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. This means that Event Attractions impacts upon Event Anticipation, which then impacts upon Attendance, so that Event Anticipation contributes to explaining why Event Attractions impacts upon Attendance. The relationship between Event Attractions and Event Anticipation is supported by qualitative findings. Participant 2 suggests that Event Anticipation occurs because Generation Z look forward to elements of the festival:

“yeah I think I’ve kind of…covered that, but just to recap, it’s to do with the experience and the promise of an experience…and then the delivery of the experience and I mean a festival is all about people…it’s heavily mediated through the people…so it’s about being around like-minded people with a common set of interests and you can go chat to somebody you can really have a warm sense of “this is my tribe”…and it’s probably the kick from…this this is not evidence based at all. It’s all about the experience and the people particularly because a festival is different to an event in that am, how would I describe it, like an event is essentially participatory…” – Participant 2

In terms of Event Anticipation and Event Attractions, Participant 1 also comments that people look forward to a range of elements at the festival, such as being uninhibited, having a safe space to feel more freedom than usual with friends and have to a positive experience with friends, which all qualify as event attractions:

“…you know whereas I think you go to a festival and it’s you know it’s what they wear like you know lads wear make-up they wear stuff that they would not do any other time of the year it’s just complete inhibition [sic] …and if you get an event to a level where people really trust it as that kind of safe space you can go…and be like free-er with your mates, just with your friends, and have a you know and have a great time…have a few drinks, do whatever you know amm yeah…so I think that’s like why they look forward to it you know what I mean and its we’re a festival like…” – Participant 1

The finding that Event Anticipation impacts upon Attendance is also supported by the qualitative findings, as Participant 1 discusses the excitement before a festival when they were young:

“…when I used to go, to go to them as a punter when I was, you know, younger like it goes back to a week before it you know…what I mean you’re you’re planning it like you’re digging out your tent, you’re digging out your stuff, then the night before you’re off to Aldi or Lidl or Tesco or wherever with your mates you know…to do the shop, the excitement is you know, you’re not
even on the the Friday and the excitement...is kind of it’s kind of...building already and then there’s you know collecting everybody, piling into the car...you know heading off like there’s just, there’s an extended level of excitement that’s not just a day or two or the three you know...amm and then obviously now with social media and stuff it runs on the following week because there’s you know...pictures and videos and stuff get shared...” – Participant 1

Whilst this participant is not directly referring to Generation Z, this extract does capture the relationship between Event Anticipation and Attendance.


In terms of indirect effects, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. This means that External Socialisation impacted upon Event Anticipation, which had an impact on Attendance. This in turn means that Event Anticipation contributes to explaining why External Socialisation impacts upon Attendance. Further investigation would be needed to see if this is supported by the experience of leaders in the festival industry and tourism sector. In this research, the relationship between External Socialisation and Event Anticipation was not investigated, however the extent to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals to make new friends or acquaintances was suggested not to be very widespread by Participant 1 and Participant 3.

“yeah a little bit it’s probably I would say it’s it’s less than 10% because...we see the figures amm at the end of the day like you know even at (specific number) cap it’s a big it’s a lot of people...so very few people I would think you know go to festivals in small groups...you know like 2/3 people even is is is would be would be quite small you know in general people are going in groups of 6/7/8...amm and as a result then you know they’re they’re hanging out with that group for the weekend I’m sure they do meet new people they do talk to people amm but I’m not sure very many go specifically to meet people” – Participant 1

“amm I think I think they make friends easily from what I’ve seen of that generation amm they make friends over a can you know “gizz a can there” you know that kind of business or you know ahh (inaudible) which nobody even thinks about is the advent of the smoking zone has become really interesting... as places where people meet, people who smoke you know amm in that generation I mean I don’t I’m not necessarily sure that they’ll go out to meet somebody there, they’ll go with friends knowing that they potentially will meet somebody else there and if it’s you know I think it’d be more they would be looking for a romantic liaison as opposed to... meeting someone who’s a mate but I think it just happens” – Participant 3

So while for many it may not be the case, it could be that for some, the opportunity to meet new people is a reason for them to look forward to and then attend a festival. It may indeed be the prospect of meeting a new romantic liaison as opposed to a new friend that the sample of Generation Z festival-goers look
forward to. The type of new friend or connection that may be made was not qualified in the survey. However, in the qualitative interviews, participants were asked directly about friends and acquaintances, which may have resulted in the two samples being asked about essentially different constructs. This would have resulted in the case that the items relating to External Socialisation were taken by the Generation Z sample who responded to the survey, to potentially relate to new romantic connections.

e). Known Group Socialisation -> Event Anticipation -> Attendance

Another indirect effect of importance is the finding that Event Anticipation mediates the positive relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance. This means that Known Group Socialisation impacts upon Event Anticipation, which in turn impacts upon Attendance, and Event Anticipation contributes to explaining why Known Group Socialisation impacts upon Attendance. There is plentiful support for the relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Event Anticipation and Known Group Socialisation and Attendance within the qualitative findings. Regarding Known Group Socialisation, Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser, made reference to socialising with one’s friend group at festivals, showing support for the finding that there is a relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance:

“…we’ve found definitely in the last couple of years is that while you know we’re we’re spending a lot of money on line-ups and…you know and big acts, and big festival acts, there is a large portion of them that are there to you know to enjoy themselves with their mates and the music has almost become a little bit secondary…amm you still have to build a strong line-up…you still have to maintain a brand…” – Participant 1

Enjoying the experience among one’s friends as a motive to attend is highlighted here by Participant 1 as being so significant that it is suggested to be primarily why a large portion of Generation Z festival-goers attend. Findings from the interview with Participant 3 also support this finding. When asked what is the most important reason to attend among Generation Z, of all of the motives mentioned by the researcher (including to experience culture, to make new friends or acquaintances, to strengthen their relationships with their current friends, to show off their experiences potentially via social media, to gain popularity and to experience flow) Participant 3 replied:
“Friends, to go with friends” – Participant 3

This quote shows significant support for the finding that there is a relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance. When discussing Generation Z at various stages during the interview, Participant 3 again emphasised the importance of socialising with friends, saying:

“yeah no question I mean I think it it’s to go with friends and share x, y, z I think actually if they just went with their friends they wouldn’t care what was happening sometimes…” – Participant 3

A multitude of quotes from the interview with Participant 3 make reference to the socialisation of friend groups:

“…they know that by going…they’ll have a bit of craic, they’re there with their mates so I think it’s the friends connection all the way and that shared experience” – Participant 3

When discussing what the key factors that motivate Generation Z to attend festivals are, Participant 3 made reference to a number of elements, including but not limited to the following:

“…drink, drink’s a big part of it, socially they want to to meet their friends and it’s a really good thing to do that isn’t in a pub…” - Participant 3

“…they come for the music definitely, they come for the art in some way shape or form, they come for whatever cultural events, but I think they come to meet people. We would often see particularly in that category people who that’s why it’s at weekends you know they’re home from college potentially amm and it’s ah, a reunion actually…of friends that they may not have seen for a while you’ll see them online we’ll put up something saying (specific band) coming and they’re like “oh my God” you know…. “Brian will you go” and they start tagging tagging…” – Participant 3

When asked specifically about the extent to which this participant thinks that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to strengthen their relationships with their current friends, Participant 3 replied:

“Yeah that’s a big part of it and it’s camaraderie and you see them when they go into you know the music events and that they’re jumping around together they know that music it’s a shared experience it’s “oh my God isn’t this great buddy” you know it’s it’s amm definitely people who go to festivals together leave going “that was mega, that was brilliant” and you’ll always remember it because it’s and even going to you know ehh (specific venue) or somewhere like that which is a music venue that’s great you go in and you do it but I think there’s something special about festivals amm whether it’s Electric Picnic or (specific festival) or whichever one is, or Oxegen when it was around amm it is a shared music experience it’s “I haven’t seen him in a
long time” or “I haven’t seen her in a long time… it’s a chance to go together, get their wellies on and stuff like that so…and the organisation is as important I think “how are we gonna get there” you know… they plan all that together” – Participant 3

In the above quotation, Participant 3 discusses before the festival occurs, how Generation Z engage in organisation with their friends and how friends plan their festival experience together, suggesting there is a relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Event Anticipation.

The relationship between Event Anticipation and Attendance has been discussed previously in section 4.6.1.1. Event Anticipation was found to have a direct effect upon Attendance, which is small in effect size.

4.6.1.3.3 Qualitative findings relating to Social Capital and Attendance
Social Capital and Attendance were measured in the SEM model and Social Capital was not found to have a significant direct impact on Attendance. Social Capital was found to have a small direct effect on Event Anticipation. There were conflicting views on the impact of Social Capital on Attendance in the qualitative data, with participants acknowledging that the showing off of experiences, potentially via social media, does occur at festivals, but that it was not said to be a sole motive for Attendance:

“social media it does play a part, I don’t know if again I’m not sure they go purely… because they can put it… up on Instagram because again you know you’re buying a ticket there’s there’s effort goes into… getting it but I think there is definitely you know you see even now like the you know the likes of phone charging units and stuff that are making a fortune because… you know when you’re constantly searching for service and you’re constantly on Instagram…” – Participant 1

Participant 2 – Tourism Organisation says that motivations are all related to the experience:

“I think again… for clarification it will be the international piece… am the motivations to attend tend to be the same kind of motivations that you get for, for various other types of tourists… it’s all to do with an experience… and experience is the currency nowadays… so it’s it’s to do with am a nice analogy ahh would be this idea of consumption, so you could have conspicuous consumption or you could have kind of conscientious ahh consumption and an example of conspicuous consumption might be and this is a crude kind of (inaudible) caricature you might have an I don’t know a rich old man going around with his Rolex, a very ostentatious flashy gold watch, and he’s projecting a sense of himself by being kind of very conspicuous in what he is consuming and presenting whereas tourism tends to be more at the conscientious end … of the scale and you can go home with bragging rights, how you can get that up on the amm the more
amm ostentatious end of things is well once you’re there you’ve got your Instagram and you’ve got your phone and you’ve got your Facebook and so on and you can do the selfie moment you can have “ha look I’m here” so it can cover a little bit of both.” – Participant 2

This Participant also acknowledges that Generation Z, along with other generations (although it’s suggested to be slightly less applicable to other generations) engage in the showing off of their experiences, potentially via social media:

“yeah I was saying that you had this idea of conspicuous consumption…and conscientious consumption and there’s something in between the two now ahh and that’s very much where your festival is. It’s your your your social currency, your bragging rights…that’s definitely there, oh yeah.” – Participant 2

When asked was this for everyone or just Generation Z, Participant 2 replied:

“amm it’s probably, m-, it’s across the range…they’re more active in it…than than the others” – Participant 2

In a similar way again, Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser discusses how the showing off of experiences at festivals is very prevalent, but this participant doesn’t think this a main motive for attendance among Generation Z festival-goers:

“…oh yeah yeah no “here I am at you know” (inaudible) certain the influencers and people like that there’s a lot (inaudible) Insta-, I would see on our Instagrams on whatever festivals and that I’m doing and and that and I (inaudible) don’t really do Snapchat so much but on Instagram and Twitter a bit you know definitely it’s about look where I am and it’s me standing beside the tent or it’s me standing beside the you know fantastic food traders or wherever amm but I don’t think that that’s their main mission that they’re going to take the pictures there. I think it’s an accidental part of being there, it’s part again they’ve grown up with that that’s how we do things we show our food we show “and look here’s my festival experience”.” – Participant 3

The above quote from Participant 3 is in line with what Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser thought regarding the showing off of experiences (i.e., the acquisition of Social Capital) as a main motive for Generation Z festival-goers. In general, neither participant thought that Generation Z go to festivals mainly for this reason, with the exception of a small number of festivals that Participant 1 mentioned, solely to do so.
4.6.1.3.4 Direct Effects: Event Anticipation

With regard to Event Anticipation, which refers to the degree to which Generation Z attendees look forward to festivals, a relation between this construct and a number of others were found. It was intended that this construct would capture the wants of Generation Z in relation to festivals in Ireland by attempting to determine how various constructs related to how much they look forward to attending festivals. The following paragraphs will identify the variables that had a direct effect upon Event Anticipation. These variables are of note as they contribute to explaining why Generation Z festival-goers look forward to festivals, which may also motivate them to go to festivals, thus, contributing to answering the research question of the current study.

a). Event Attractions -> Event Anticipation

Event Attractions was found to have a small significant direct effect on Event Anticipation. Qualitative findings emerged supporting the above quantitative finding. Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser, when asked what are the key elements that lead Generation Z to look forward to festivals, commented:

“meeting friends… amm the-, I think they’re quite savvy with their money so I think for them when they’ve invested in a festival amm they are really looking for -, they’ve they’ve selected it because they know it’s something they’re going to like, having said that they buy tickets for Electric Picnic every year and they don’t know what’s coming up like Electric Picnic is not announced until the following year but they know that the experience that they’re going to have there is going to be a good one… yeah so again it’s the reunions, it’s meeting friends, it’s having a few drinks, having the craic, seeing a band that they really like…seeing you know a theatre show often that they really like, going to see films that they really like amm, and having the opportunity sometimes particularly if you’re outside Dublin to see work that you would not ordinarily see …you know that’s really important that they would get to see work that yes it’s always shown in Dublin but my God it’s down in the Marquee in Cork now” – Participant 3

Here the attractions of the event are what are suggested to be what Generation Z festival-goers look forward to. These may include being able to socialise with friends, the overall positive experience, having a few drinks, the craic, seeing bands that appeal to them and theatre shows or films, or work that one may not usually see in the area in which the festival is being held. Thus, this quantitative finding is being supported by Participant 3’s commentary. In a similar vein, Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser suggests that Generation Z look forward to festivals for a number of reasons:
“...it’s that thing of like you know if you go out we’ll say you know if you’re from I don’t know, (Researcher’s hometown), all right like it’s all right it’s a big town am but like there’s there’s restrictions probably in your own head as to you know how much of a good time you can have on a Saturday night because you’re likely to run into your neighbour, your dog-walker...your cousin, your whoever, you know whereas I think you go to a festival and it’s you know it’s what they wear like you know lads wear make-up they wear stuff that they would not do any other time of the year it’s just complete inhibition [sic]...and if you get an event to a level where people really trust it as that kind of safe space you can go...and be like free-er with your mates, just with your friends, and have a you know and have a great time...have a few drinks, do whatever you know amm yeah...so I think that’s like why they look forward to it” – Participant 1

Participant 1 suggests that Generation Z look forward to having a safe space where they can act without feeling inhibited, be with friends, have a good experience and have a few drinks. Although Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser, and Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser, cited some different elements (Event Attractions) of a festival as reasons why Generation Z look forward to festivals, they also cited some of the same ones, such as having a good experience, being in the presence of friends and having a few drinks. It could be said that Known Group Socialisation also acts as an Event Attraction in this instance and so there is some crossover here in terms of the qualitative findings, although these two constructs (Known Group Socialisation and Event Attractions) were measured as separate entities in the quantitative survey.

b). External Socialisation/Known Group Socialisation -> Event Anticipation

Those constructs which were found to have significant but small direct effects on Event Anticipation were External Socialisation and Known Group Socialisation. Qualitative findings emerged supporting the above quantitative findings. Participant 2 – Tourism Organisation, discussed what makes people look forward to festivals and talked about:

“yeah I think I’ve kind of...covered that, but just to recap, it’s to do with the experience and the promise of an experience...and then the delivery of the experience and I mean a festival is all about people...it’s heavily mediated through the people...so it’s about being around like-minded people with a common set of interests and you can go chat to somebody you can really have a warm sense of “this is my tribe”...and it’s probably the kick and am this is just a hunch from...this this is not evidence based at all. It’s all about the experience and the people particularly because a festival is different to an event in that am, how would I describe it, like am an event is essentially participatory...” – Participant 2

The above extract could relate to the quantitative finding of either External Socialisation or Known Group Socialisation having a direct impact on Event Anticipation. In terms of Known Group Socialisation impacting upon Event...
Anticipation, qualitative findings emerged supporting this finding. The finding that Known Group Socialisation had a small but direct significant effect on Event Anticipation is supported by findings from the interview with Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser. Participant 1 discusses what the key elements that lead Generation Z to look forward to festivals are and among Participant 1’s replies, there is a reference to being with friends:

“…you can go…and be like free-er with your mates, just with your friends, and have a you know and have a great time…have a few drinks, do whatever you know amm yeah…so I think that’s like why they look forward to it” – Participant 1

(c). Social Capital/Perceived Popularity/Flow -> Event Anticipation

The constructs that were found to have significant but small direct effects on Event Anticipation were Social Capital, Perceived Popularity and Flow. The finding that Social Capital has a direct impact upon Event Anticipation was not investigated during the qualitative data collection phase. Perceived Popularity was found to have a small direct effect on Event Anticipation during the quantitative data collection phase. However, it was found that Perceived Popularity was not perceived to motivate Generation Z to attend festivals, in the qualitative data collection phase. Participants were asked about what they think are the key elements that lead Generation Z to look forward to festivals as opposed to being asked specifically about constructs that may relate to Event Anticipation. Thus, the relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation was not investigated specifically during the qualitative data collection phase, however Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser did comment that:

“…and be like free-er with your mates, just with your friends, and have a you know and have a great time…have a few drinks, do whatever you know amm yeah…so I think that’s like why they look forward to it” – Participant 1

Here, the experiential elements of the festival such as having a great time, being free-er (both similar to elements of Jackson and Marsh’s 1996 (p.18) definition of Flow: “[w]hen in flow, a person becomes totally involved in an activity and experiences a number of positive experiential characteristics, including freedom from self-consciousness and great enjoyment of the process”) are suggested to be related to Generation Z looking forward to festivals.
4.6.1.3.5 Moderation Interaction

A moderated effect, stated in the alternative hypothesis format sets out to ascertain whether a proposed moderator variable strengthens (dampens) the positive (negative) relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable. In terms of moderation, it was found that Inhibition strengthens the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation. This suggests that at higher levels of Inhibition, the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation is amplified or strengthened. This finding will be discussed in more depth in the Discussion and Analysis chapter.

4.6.2 Objective 2: To evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how this generation interacts with festivals in Ireland.

The second objective of the current study is to evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how this generation interacts with festivals in Ireland. This objective firstly relates to the finding that Generation Z are the first generation to have lived in a world where the Internet has always existed (Prensky, 2001 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104). Similarly, this objective relates to the finding by YSI and Amárach Research (2019) that four hours was the mean quantity of time which Generation Z respondents in Ireland used their smartphones for each day (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019b). These two findings necessitated an objective which explores how technology impacts upon how Generation Z festival-goers’ interact with festivals in Ireland. The second objective therefore intends to contribute to answering the overall research question, and it is intended that in meeting this objective, insights into both the motivations and the behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland may be revealed. The above objective will be met by exploring the findings in relation to the Social Capital construct.

4.6.2.1 Direct Effects: Social Capital

Social Capital was found to have a small direct effect upon Event Anticipation in the quantitative findings of this study. Although this relationship was not specifically investigated in the qualitative data collection phase, Social Capital (in other words, i.e., showing off experiences, potentially via social media) was asked about in all three interviews and all three participants referred to the
concept of it, not referring to the term itself but making reference to it in other words, as being a part of Generation Z’s festival experience. All participants acknowledged that the showing off of experiences at festivals, potentially via social media, occurs prevalently. When asked to what extent do they think that Generation Z is motivated to go to festivals to show off their experiences, potentially via social media, Participant 2 – Tourism Organisation replied:

“yeah I was saying that you had this idea of conspicuous consumption…and conscientious consumption and there’s something in between the two now ah and that’s very much where your festival is. It’s your your your social currency, your bragging rights…that’s definitely there, oh yeah.”

When asked was this for everyone or just Generation Z, Participant 2 replied:

“amm it’s probably, m-, it’s across the range…they’re more active in it…than than the others” – Participant 2

Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser suggested that there were thousands of social media tags in relation to a festival this participant is associated with last year:

“like there’s loads of them like so you could sc- scroll forever” – Participant 1

Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser also suggested that Generation Z engage in the sharing of their experiences more now, in comparison to 4 to 5 years ago:

“…you know when you’re constantly searching for service and you’re constantly on Instagram…you know you’re killing battery so like…there amm 4 or 5 years ago we would have seen everybody come with burner phones you know…you know the old Nokia, swap…the sim out…and it would be stay charged for the weekend, that’s gone now…and everybody’s bringing their smart phone because they you know they want to be able to post to Instagram and Snapchat (inaudible)” – Participant 1

Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser, commented on the prevalence of capturing experiences and sharing these experiences on social media among Generation Z:

“yeah they all do, they all share it they they photograph it they tweet it they Instagram it they snap it amm and they talk about it afterwards as well if they’ve not had a good experience you’ll know about it” – Participant 3
Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser, commented on the savviness of Generation Z in terms of how they capture their experiences:

“…so they’ll tell you if the experience isn’t good or if it isn’t but they do am they do want to tell everyone about it they do want to photograph it and they’re quite savvy and experienced with cameras amm whether it’s like they go around with an actual really decent camera …or whether they just use their phones and a lot of them will just use their phones going to to festivals they know what makes a good image look good and what filters to use and that you know…so they would put a lot of work into that I think.” – Participant 3

Participant 3 was asked to what extent do they think that technology affects how present and in the moment Generation Z attendees are at their festival or festivals. Participant 3 replied:

“I think it depends on what- what they’re watching so I remember at (specific band), nobody had a phone out…which is rare” – Participant 3

Participant 3 comments that it’s unusual not to see Generation Z watching an experience via their phone.

“I remember looking down and there’s no one watching it through their phone which you usually see…you go to anything, (specific experience) or whatever people are watching stuff through their phone this is now they are 18 – 24 this group and they’re dancing and they’re dancing there’s no phones out and I thought that was really really interesting actually am because it does play a huge part…” – Participant 3

Participant 3 comments that:

“…I don’t think they go to show it off I think it’s just an innate organic part of it” – Participant 3

Thus, the showing off of experiences is prevalent and it is part of the festival experience, but this participant doesn’t think it’s why Generation Z attend. While this generation is suggested to engage in the showing off of experiences, it’s not to the same extent for every event:

“…you know like that but they I mean there’s no question they do they do take pictures and it’s a big…part of it but also the reverse is that they don’t always, if-, I’ve found that it often depends on what the event is” – Participant 3

Whilst there are certainly several references to the acquisition of Social Capital, Participant 1 and 3 both reflected that they don’t think this is the sole reason that
Generation Z go to festivals. As well as that, Participant 3 believes that they do it, but that the reverse is also true - they don’t always do it. Although Participant 3 specified that at a specific festival they work on, while they are thinking of their sponsors constantly, they do make the festival aesthetically appealing but suggests that this effort is not necessarily just for Generation Z. This participant also says however that they do ensure that one venue that is for this age-group will photograph well also:

“…but we do make it pretty and we do that for everybody to be fair because yes we do need a good photographic experience we want to see that the pictures that are online or the pictures that we take from our professional photographers…are good, so there’s no question amm that we’ll do that, do we direct it at a particular demographic I don’t think so…you know we’ll do it for for all ages but you know so your (specific venue) is exclusively that that age-group gen-, you know, Generation Z you know we’ll make sure that it’s that (specific aesthetics) that there’s good you know really nice (specific experience) going on you’re gonna get great pictures from that …so maybe we do it without even thinking about it” - Participant 3

4.6.2.2 Social Capital and Flow

Participant 2 – Tourism Organisation, discusses how these two concepts, Social Capital and Flow, possibly shouldn’t be viewed as distinct from each other any more. Participant 2 was asked to what extent they think technology affects how present and in the moment Generation Z attendees are at festivals. Interestingly, Participant 2 replied:

“amm do you know what, I’d nearly say that our sense of, as a society, our sense of being present is probably evolving…and amm do you could be present and just you and I are present…in the conversation now amm but if if you’ve captured like you’re digitally capturing this through a sound piece but if you’re capturing a a picture or a clip…and that’s how you go back and you-, you look back upon it and you you your six months later it pops upon your, six months ago the phone tells you you were here, and you go back and you enjoy it again, your, I don’t, I think we need to to loo-, not have an either or view of presence anymore…I think the technology can distract from being present…but it can also enhance and give an afterglow of presence because we we tend to think of the the phone as being “oh well I’m talking to you now but I’m looking at this thing here and jeez I’m being a bit rude” and yeah that that’s true but if I’m looking at it to curate it in some sense, that’s not the same thing as it’s either or…it’s this and….so it’s about complementing presence rather than competing with presence if I haven’t made up a whole new…thing for you I don’t know” – Participant 2

In a similar way, when asked how technology affects how engaged Generation Z are with the content at Participant 1’s festival, Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser replied:
“they’re lesser they’re lesser engaged because of the amount of time they spend on their phone I think it’s you know they’re still engaged to a high extent at the gig because you know…(inaudible) they’re immersed in it and they’re there so but less so (inaudible)” – Participant 1

So although Generation Z may distracted by possibly attempting to acquire Social Capital, they are still highly engaged. Participant 2 focuses on how technology can “…enhance and give an afterglow of presence…”. Participant 1 is suggesting that while Generation Z festival-goers are less engaged, they are still highly engaged. Participant 1’s reflection that although this generation are distracted by their phones, they are still highly engaged, may be especially so for this generation, who have never lived in a world where the Internet hasn’t existed, and may be able to accommodate being distracted by, to a degree, technology, but may also manage to stay highly engaged, more so than previous generations. This poses an interesting opportunity for future research.

Participant 3, when asked to what extent do they think that technology affects how engaged Generation Z attendees are with the content of their festival, replied:

“they’re always on their phones…like as in sending text messages and checking stuff and…like there’s always even even if they’re not taking pictures and that they are the phone comes out the back pocket, they’re checking it, they’re putting it away amm but I think often actually you know and (inaudible) again it depe-, it’s very specific to very specific events if they’re bored the phone will be out more you know…but if they’re really invested in watching something like technology is their everything, they ch-, they pay their bills with it they know that generation don’t carry cash probably…you know so for them it’s their it’s their photographic machine it’s their money machine it’s their checking in on granny machine…you know it’s all of that so you know whether it’s checking their texts because they’ve lost someone and that they’ll always be on that and then you know there will be people watching as I said concerts through their phone but amm I I don’t think you can avoid that kind of…if it’s down to phones and stuff don’t think you can avoid that technology you know” – Participant 3

Here, it is suggested that if the festival-goers are bored, then they engage more with their phones. When asked what this participant believes leads Generation Z attendees to engage and be in the moment at their festivals, Participant 3 responded:

“a really good act…a really good act that you know provides really good lighting, really good production, amm that ticks everything in the box that they expect it to be they don’t like waiting they hate queues…and being made to wait for stuff and unfortunately for some of it that you’re going to have to do that you know there’s waiting to get stuff set up you know they don’t like to wait for that but you know if you deliver them a good quality sound, sound is very important…if they can’t hear it they’ll let you know you know and they’ll or if it’s you know just like it’s too hot, if they’re uncomfortable in any way you know they won’t like that…” – Participant 3
Finally, when commenting on how best to engage this generation, Participant 3 comments that if you can deliver the best possible experience, they will be engaged:

“...I think if you can deliver the best possible experience for them they’ll be in-, they’ll be absorbed...” – Participant 3

4.6.2.3 Comparison of groups: Social Capital

All constructs were compared based on gender (male and female) and age (young and old). It must be noted that these analyses were carried out on constructs which were not validated. These constructs were later validated at the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) stage but the results relating to the comparison of groups being discussed here, relate to constructs which were not validated. Interestingly, Social Capital was the only construct in which statistically significant differences emerged between groups, and in this case, it was between males and females. No statistically significant differences emerged between the younger and older groups of Generation Z. Females were found to have significantly higher scores on Social Capital than had males (U = 1383, z = -2.593, p = .010). Although the qualitative findings do not definitively support the suggestion that females engage more in acquiring Social Capital, Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser, did make a comment regarding a gender difference related to the various social media platforms used. When this participant was asked to what extent do they think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to show off their experiences, potentially via social media, Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser replied:

“yeah, like completely you know we’ve done a bit of research over the years on it and like you know and definitely with Generation Z like they’ve moved away from the you know the the older ones so like Facebook...would be very low use ...amm Twitter you know would be lesser again and we’ve seen a definite amm male/female bias am in that you know for, for girls it’s very high push on Instagram and Snapchat and now I suppose moving in now even into you know TikTok and different you know...the newer again ones but amm there’s a definite move away from from Facebook” – Participant 1

Participant 1 also commented during the interview that:

“...like I said it’s you know it’s probably ninety per cent plus Instagram and Snapchat with with girls....and it’s maybe you know 60% Instagram Snapchat with...with boys and they’re still
Twitter and Facebook you know a little bit more… amm it seems to be that the Twitter because we’ve spoken to these people and the lads are on Twitter because it’s a it’s a place for sport… seems to be the answer you know for news, sports news, maybe… so so they’re more active on Twitter and obviously that’s not to say that girls don’t play sport but… but it’s that… (inaudible) there’s obviously a much higher… proportion of lads that are into what’s happening in the premiership or you know what did Roy Keane say yesterday on sky sports so they’re on Twitter more active so they when they go to a festival they’re posting on Twitter… to a (inaudible) to a higher extent than than the girls are… and the girls are almost all Instagram and Snapchat” – Participant 1

Potentially, this quantitative finding has emerged given that some social media platforms are more suitable for sharing experiences, and thus, it could be that those social media platforms that are utilised more among females, are used for this purpose. In that case, the quantitative and qualitative findings are in line with each other, however this is merely a possibility and obviously cannot be taken as definitive. In general, the qualitative findings suggest that Facebook has lower usage among Generation Z. In a similar way to Participant 1, Participant 3 commented that:

“…you’ll see them online we’ll put up something saying (specific band) coming and they’re like “oh my God”… and they start tagging tagging… (inaudible) I say Facebook mainly on Instagram actually they don’t really do Facebook… it’s not a big thing for them their big ones are Snapchat and Instagram for the, for that generation” - Participant 3

4.6.3 Objective 3: To appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers’ level of attendance and participation at festivals.

The third objective intended to appraise the motives of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, specifically those motives that influence Generation Z’s attendance and participation at festivals. Those variables that have a relationship with Attendance are notable in terms of contributing to explaining why Generation Z festival-goers are motivated to attend festivals. In addition, those variables that have a relationship with Flow are notable in terms of contributing to explaining Generation Z festival-goers’ level of participation at festivals, which relates to Generation Z festival-goers’ behaviour. Therefore, by meeting this objective, it is intended that a contribution will be made to answering the research question, which is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’. The above objective is met by presenting the findings that relate to the Attendance and Flow constructs.
4.6.3.1 Attendance
The findings relating to Attendance have been addressed under Objective 1. The findings relating to Attendance will be summarised here. Firstly, the proposed SEM model accounts for 45% of the variance in Attendance with particular reference to the following combinations of statistically significant predictor variables: Flow, Event Attractions and Event Anticipation. Each of these three predictors demonstrated an almost equal moderate magnitude impact on Attendance. In terms of direct effects, Flow, Event Anticipation and Event Attractions were each found to have a significant direct effect on Attendance. In terms of indirect effects, Flow was firstly found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. Secondly, Flow was found to mediate the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. Next, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. Fourthly, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. Finally, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance.

4.6.3.2 Flow
The findings relating to participation, which, in turn, relate to the behaviour of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, will be addressed by reporting the findings in relation to Flow in the following paragraphs.

4.6.3.2.1 Direct Effects: Flow
a). External Socialisation -> Flow
The most important relationship that emerged in the direct effect findings was that of the impact of External Socialisation on Flow. This effect was medium in size. External Socialisation had a positive direct effect on Flow. This relationship wasn’t directly addressed in the qualitative interviews. However, the level of External Socialisation that occurs at festivals was queried. When asked to what extent do they think Generation Z attendees attend festivals to make new friends or acquaintances, Participant 1 - Music Festival Organiser replied:

“yeah a little bit it’s probably I would say it’s it’s less than 10%...” – Participant 1
Participant 3 also reflected that the level of External Socialisation that they have observed in terms of being the reason Generation Z attendees attend festivals isn’t significant, saying:

“amm I think I think they make friends easily from what I’ve seen of that generation amm they make friends over a can you know “gizz a can there” you know that kind of business or you know ahh (inaudible) which nobody even thinks about is the advent of the smoking zone has become really interesting…as places where people meet, people who smoke you know amm in that generation I mean I don’t I’m not necessarily sure that they’ll go out to meet somebody there, they’ll go with friends knowing that they potentially will meet somebody else there and if it’s you know I think it’d be more they would be looking for a romantic liaison as opposed to…meeting someone who’s a mate but I think it just happens” – Participant 3

So it would appear that the extent to which Generation Z engage in External Socialisation might be low, and it could potentially be facilitated to increase Flow levels among Generation Z.

b). Event Attractions -> Flow

A second very important direct effect to note was that of Event Attractions on Flow. The effect of Event Attractions on Flow was also medium in size. This finding may relate to the fact that it’s the content of the festival that facilitates Flow. Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser discussed how the content of a festival facilitates Generation Z in experiencing this. When asked to what extent are Generation Z motivated to attend festivals to experience Flow, Participant 3 described scenes wherein Generation Z experience Flow, which related to festival content, which could also be looked upon as Event Attractions. Participant 3 commented:

“ahh yeah they definitely do like when they when they’re in that like zone with their music or you know and it can be a band or it can be a DJ emm or even in a (specific experience) experience where they’re just floating and they’re just doing something and they come out and go “wow that was amazing” you know they’re definitely living their best life you know they’re it’s it is something that ah feeds them I think it feeds something in all of us, there’s an emotional connection, because of course there is there’s an emotional connection with music it’s either to our heartbeat and we feel it through us you know…” – Participant 3

c). Flow -> Attendance

Another important direct effect was that of the impact of Flow on Attendance. The effect size is small. This is of significance and was backed up by qualitative
findings also. This was discussed previously when addressing Objective 1, in section 4.6.1.3.1(a).

d). Flow -> Event Anticipation
Flow was found to have a small direct effect upon Event Anticipation. This was previously identified in section 4.6.1.3.4 (c).

4.6.3.2.2 Indirect Effects: Flow
In terms of indirect effects, Flow was found to mediate a number of relationships.

a). External Socialisation -> Flow -> Attendance
Significantly, it was shown that Flow mediates the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. This was described in section 4.6.1.3.2 (a).

b). Event Attractions -> Flow -> Attendance
Flow was also found to mediate the relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. This has been described in section 4.6.1.3.2 (b).

4.6.3.2.3 Moderation Interaction
In terms of moderation, it was found that Inhibition strengthens the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation. This suggests that at higher levels of Inhibition, the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation is amplified or strengthened. This finding was described in section 4.6.1.3.5.

The findings in relation to objective 2 are also of relevance in answering objective 3.

4.6.4 Objective 4: To determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers' behaviour at festivals.
The fourth objective specifically intends to determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers’ behaviour at festivals. By meeting this objective, a contribution will be made to explaining the overall research question, which is as
follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’. The above objective was met by themes which emerged from the qualitative data, with one finding also emerging from the quantitative data. These themes include: ‘Generation Z’s positive behaviour’, ‘Generation Z’s need for reassurance’, ‘Generation Z’s motivations and behaviours in relation to money’, ‘Expectations of Generation Z festival-goers’, ‘Generation Z as Smart/Savvy’ and ‘Social Capital - Gender Differences’.

4.6.4.1 Generation Z’s positive behaviour

Objective 4 was investigated in the qualitative data collection phase and in general, the behaviour of Generation Z was found to be positive in the overall sense. Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser talked about the fact that Generation Z are well-behaved in general:

“Yeah in general they’re they’re pretty good like and they’re you know they’re pretty well behaved they’re pretty…you know amm pliable you know to do what they what they’re asked to do and you know when you’re running an event of that size like you have to move people around the site and you have to create ingress and egress…and flow you know and all of the rest of it am in general they’re pretty good you know… (specific festival) has a low amm-ish you know low numbers of public order and that kind of stuff…” – Participant 1

Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser, suggested that the behaviour of Generation Z is positive and commented a number of times on their behaviour at festivals:

“…they know how to festival…amm you know they know that the portaloos are going to be filthy by the end of the night you know there’s there’s always a small you know minority of them that’ll misbehave you know am so you’ve to keep an eye on them you’ll know you’ll kind of see then they’ll get drunk and get rowdy and they’ll have a fight but in general their behaviour in my experience it-, it hasn’t been trouble actually…I’ve always observed they want to enjoy themselves…as much as possible they want to enjoy the event with their friends they want to have a positive experience they live in a life now where mindfulness is talked about all the time, good mental health, does this make me feel good? Great” – Participant 3

In the above quotation, Participant 3 suggests that although there might be small degree of misbehaviour among this generation, overall, they just want to have a good time. In the following quotations, Participant 3 makes reference to the positive behaviour of this generational cohort:

“I like that generation I think they’re good” – Participant 3
Participant 3 below comments that this generation behaves relatively well and is very familiar with festivals:

“…they’re used to festivals and they behave relatively well at festivals…and I think that’s really important because families are always expected to behave well anyway but students—eh you know not students but that kind of generation which they are a lot of them are students that Generation Z person is amm very clued in…they know they’re getting a wristband on their hand, you know they know that they can take their drink in in a plastic glass…”

Again, comments that this generation is familiar with festivals, and this is because they have grown up with them.

“…they’re really easy actually…you know they’re easy festival-goers, they understand how festivals work, they’ve grown up with them…” - Participant 3

These extracts are in line with each other and suggest that overall, Generation Z behave well at festivals.

4.6.4.2 Generation Z’s need for reassurance

An interesting finding specifically from the qualitative data collection phase was a finding that emerged from the interview carried out with Participant 2. Participant 2 – Tourism Organisation mentioned that Generation Z tourists from overseas unexpectedly do use tourist offices, whilst this Participant anticipated that they would be less inclined to do so as it would be expected that they would use their phones for information. Whilst this is not specifically related to festivals, it is an interesting behavioural characteristic of Generation Z that has been observed:

“what we have found is that curiously in some ways that generation is not very different particularly in the overseas side to the rest of the tourism market…ahh what we did find quite curiously is that for that age group they’re actually more inclined to say use a tourist office or ask questions of others, because they’ve relatively less life experience, they’re looking to lean on others to get a st-, a steer. So they might go into a tourist office, for example, and look to find out what’s on in the area, what’s on in the next…place I’m visiting. They’re actually more likely to use our services. We thought they wouldn’t be…we thought they wouldn’t be…as inclined to use our services because it’s all about the phone, but that’s not the reality of it…amm people, particularly of the younger cohort, they like to know they’ve made good decisions…and they like to have those decisions validated or corrected if they’re not right…and using people to do that is a great way of validating …that when you’re in a strange environment. So that’s kind of the the kind of the curious thing that we found that we didn’t…expect to find when we went in there. So we’re very conscious now of of ah when we do that, kind of reassurance-giving and so on you know” – Participant 2
4.6.4.3 Generation Z’s motivations and behaviours in relation to money

Although Generation Z’s motivations and behaviours relating to money were not investigated in the online self-administered survey, this cohort’s motivations and behaviours relating to money were referred to in the qualitative data collection stage. It was suggested that this generation are economical by both Participant 1 and Participant 3:

“Now the only problem is getting them to part with their money (laughs) which is very difficult…” – Participant 3

Participant 3 comments on this generation being savvy with their money:

“…I think they’re quite savvy with their money so I think for them when they’ve invested in a festival amm they are really looking for -, they’ve they’ve selected it because they know it’s something they’re going to like, having said that they buy tickets for Electric Picnic every year and they don’t know what’s coming up like Electric Picnic is not announced until the following year but they know that the experience that they’re going to have there is going to be a good one…” - Participant 3

Participant 1 comments that Generation Z is more economical than the generation preceding them:

“…I think they’re far more clued into you know you know not wasting money than what’s the one before…” – Participant 1 (“one” here is referring to ‘generation’)

Participant 1 also comments that this generation’s behaviours in relation to money may be a function of the era in which they have lived:

“…we drank more, amm we definitely were less frugal with whatever money we had…amm the kind of Gen X[sic], you know that age group now, amm they don’t drink as much, they’re much more into their looks…amm they take more drugs at festivals amm than than we did amm and I think because you know they’ve, you know for us we were the other way, where you know our age group was you know kind of came up through a depression and then we got a boom and they’ve come from a boom into a recession you know in…in the late noughties kind of thing and they’re just more clever you know they’re just smarter…with their money kind of at festivals you know going into the shop for trying to buy boiling water for their pot noodle…they’re looking to go home with a few quid where I think we were quite happy to spend it all…” – Participant 1

4.6.4.4 Expectations of Generation Z festival-goers

The expectations of Generation Z festival-goers in relation to festivals were not investigated in the self-administered online survey, however findings in relation to this emerged in the qualitative data collection stage. Participant 1 and
Participant 3 both commented on what Generation Z festival-goers want in relation to festivals, with several different aspects mentioned:

“I think they’re they are keen to experience new things…I think that’s a really big thing they’re always interested in doing something new” – Participant 3

Participant 3 made reference various elements of a festival experience that Generation Z festival-goers engage in, and what they expect at their various festival experiences:

“…they’ll pay €300 for an Electric Picnic ticket…ticket no bother and they know they’ll buy it in September and they’ll save throughout the year for it they’ll get a tent, they’ll get a camper van, this is really… you know they they will-, they don’t do sloshing around in mud you know they already know that they’ll bring wet wipes and stuff like that they know how to use and they hate them but they do use the the toilets you know those chemical toilets I find that that that generation are, they’ve grown up with festivals in their but they want a lot more, (specific festival) they want to have their yoga experience, they want to have their raw milk amm drink, they want to have you know we would provide food traders emm and we would have to have gluten-free amm which is great, because we should be made to have that kind of stuff anyway but artisan foods you know…” – Participant 3

Participant 3 also made reference to various food and beverage options that Generation Z festival-goers want, as well as their desire for clean toilets:

“Yeah they want avocado on toast you know they are very clear amm eh they want cl-, you know they want clean toilets you know they want good ahh quality beers and and spirits and all of that you know they want good drink. Gone be with the days of like flinging stuff at them rubbish food and you know a few chips in a thing they they… know what their, you know which is what it used to be a bit ketchup on some chips, they know what their festival experience should be like” – Participant 3

Participant 3 also commented that this generation has travelled to festivals in Europe and they have a level of expectation about what their festival experiences should include because of this. This participant also mentions that this generational cohort is clever, and, that they engage making plans before and during their festival experience.

“…remember they’ve travelled to Europe they’ve flown out Ryanair to Berlin and gone to a festival out there…they’ve gone to Hyde Park in London you know for the BST amm festivals every summer, they know what it should be, they want a carnival you know they want the the big wheel amm you know and they’ll pay for that they’ll some festivals you know that generation
they want to be able to get their hair blow dried, which you can you know…at some some festivals, they want to know that there’s a place where they can go and charge their phones where they can amm you know ahh there’s a lost and found, they want to know they they’ve very clever (inaudible) they’ll make a meeting point, right we’re gonna meet here afterwards, they know where the- where their their camping site is they know they’re going to spend a lot of time in traffic so sometimes they’ll come on a bus so they don’t have to do that like I said camper vans are a really big thing…because they like their luxury as well you know ….so they’ll club together and get a, a camper van but they are amm they they plan well I think  from my experience now….” – Participant 3

Participant 3 mentions that, in this participant’s experience, they are familiar with craft beers:

“…they’re very sophisticated in terms, from my experience, of am, what their craft beers are…”  
– Participant 3

Participant 3 also made the point that although, for example, a food offering may be relatively expensive, this generation expects it to be so:

“…the family will come and go “7 quid for a burger! You’ve got to be kidding me I’ve to feed a family of four”…the younger people will not think about that actually they’ll go…like that’s their expectation they know this is what a burger costs a a rustic burger on a ciabatta bread you know they know that that’s you know what it what it will cost they don’t want us to put McDonalds on site necessarily you know…” – Participant 3

Participant 3 makes the point that the festivals for which Generation Z are the main source of income, keep adding to their festival offering:

“…they are a very serious source of income for festivals and that’s me being very blunt about it you know it’s not about just giving them the experience they are a very good source of income, certainly a building one for some festivals, obviously Electric Picnic it’s their only source of income you know…a few older people go but it’s that generation amm so nurturing them and finding out what are the different things that they want because even in the likes of you know so I say (specific festival) and Electric Picnic again because they would be the-, probably the two big ones. They’re constantly expanding what they’re giving - childcare ahh special amm places near you know and some of these like there are some young people who do have little small ones you know amm making sure that camper vans are nearer to the site also for younger people further away from kids you know…they don’t wanna be anywhere near them you know so I think they’re they (inaudible) from what they garner from their surveys they definitely keep seem to be adding things in every year like the blow-dry bar and…you know who thought you could get your hair blow dried…on a on a campsite” – Participant 3
Participant 3 also makes the point that Generation Z will buy the “VIP ticket experience” and mentions that Generation Z like having wristbands, and that it is a good idea to make them colourful and bright:

“…like champagne they want you know to go into the Moet bar and and buy champagne they want the VIP ticket experience as well …so they will buy the VIP ticket which gives you bells and whistles and special parking and you get…(inaudible) your wristband… they love they love wristbands you know…that generation loves having a wristband around their their arms so you know we al-, you know its’ always a good idea make it colourful make it bright and make it have different meanings you know this lanyard gets you in to x place…and that you know…” – Participant 3

Participant 1 makes reference to the elements of the festival experience which have grown in importance:

“…campsites, toilets, access, price, all of those things have become more important…and the general atmosphere and the vibe and the actual line-up has become slightly less important…” – Participant 1

Participant 1 also mentions that this generation can watch Coachella online, and although they don’t expect the same level of production, it would annoy them if the stage at the festival that this participant is mainly associated with, was the back of a truck. They expect the production, tents and facilities to be better:

“…they’re just smarter you know what I mean and they see like they you know they go onto they watch Coachella live stream…and they don’t expect to go to (specific festival) and get the same production as Coachella but they would be very annoyed if they walked in and the main stage was the back of a truck…so you know there’s there’s a balance you’ve gotta find a (inaudible), they expect better production, better tents, better facilities, amm and like yeah and if you get it wrong it can go viral pretty quickly” – Participant 1

When Participant 1 was asked, “…what do you currently know about the wants and needs of Generation Z attendees who attend your festival?” this participant commented:

“amm the wants and needs like I said I think the you know phone charging…amm Wi-Fi enabled campsites…” – Participant 1

In addition to Participants 1 and 3 commenting on the sorts of elements that Generation Z festival-goers want are, both participants also commented that
Generation Z festival-goers will let you know when their expectations are not met. For example, Participant 3 asserts:

“(specific festival), they had a really big problem last year with their (specific problem), I don’t really know the festival very well but my God did Facebook light up - for all of them that are not on Facebook they got their way onto Facebook and they were like really cross about it and…so they’ll tell you if the experience isn’t good or if it isn’t but they do am they do want to tell everyone about it” – Participant 3

4.6.4.5 Generation Z as smart/savvy

All three participants commented on the savvy nature of this Generation. Participant 3 commented that they are clued in, they know how to festival and they know what to expect from their different festival experiences:

“…that Generation Z person is amm very clued in…they know they’re getting a wristband on their hand, you know they know that they can take their drink in in a plastic glass…they will go and they will relax they’ll come before a gig they’ll find the bar, onsite bar for instance in a in a community festival they’ll relax, have a few drinks and then go in for the gig and they’ll dance their socks off you know…amm they’re going for the music if they go to a (specific experience) event they’re going to, they know this stuff…so when they go into a festival setting they’re already clued in…they’re very emm I certainly find they’re very savvy…” – Participant 3

To this participant, Generation Z are also cultured:

“they’re quite cultured actually I find” – Participant 3

In addition, Participant 3 commented:

“…they know that they can’t take pictures in an art gallery they’re clever you know they already know…that they can’t do that…” – Participant 3

To Participant 2, their sophistication is clear in their awareness of being marketed to. They are suggested to be:

“…more sophisticated than the average punter…” – Participant 2

When Participant 2 asked if there are any challenges associated with marketing to this generation, this participant replied:

“oh God. Of course there are! And it’s the same as if you’re marketing anything to them ahh so we’re not unique in tourism in that regard but there is this kind of amm level of sophistication amongst them a as people who are aware that they’re being marketed to …they’re more sophisticated than the average punter, but they’ve also got I suppose an attention span, amm
they’ve got an attention span that is appropriate to what they’ve been exposed to, so they’re very
good at filtering and knocking things off their radar (inaudible) or moving on quickly whereas
others might linger through…” – Participant 2

Participant 1 refers to this generation as being smarter and cleverer with their money:

“…they’re just more clever you know they’re just smarter…with their money kind of at festivals
you know going into the shop for trying to buy boiling water for their pot noodle” – Participant 1

Participant 1 comments that this generation is smarter given the fact that they
have access to so much information:

“…and they’re they’re just more intelligent as well I mean they’ve got access to way more data
amm you know via social media, the Internet, all that kind of stuff…so you know they you can
you can’t kind of trick them…amm they’re just a bit you know they’re you know they know what
they’re, what they want, amm at an event and if you don’t deliver it you find out about it pretty
quickly, on social media” – Participant 1

Overall, the qualitative data collection stage was hugely insightful in terms of
giving a vivid overview of Generation Z in general as well as how they behave at
festivals, contributing to a great extent in answering the research question of the
current study.

4.6.4.6 Social Capital – Gender differences
As discussed previously, the sample of Generation Z who participated in the
study responded to items relating to the degree to which Generation Z is
motivated to go to festivals in order to show off their experiences, potentially via
social media. Female respondents were found to have significantly different
scores to males on this construct, suggesting that they engage more in this
activity at festivals. Social Capital scores for males (mean rank = 53.93) and
females (mean rank = 72.10) were statistically significantly different, U = 1383,
z = -2.593, p = .010. It must be noted that the group comparisons were conducted
before the constructs were validated, so the results relate to constructs which
were not yet validated.
4.6.5 Objective 5: To identify the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z in the short and medium term.

By meeting the fifth objective, it is intended that the factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term will be identified. The factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z will be those constructs that showed significant relationships with Attendance and Event Anticipation. These factors will therefore relate to why Generation Z festival-goers go to festivals, and why they look forward to festivals, and their expectations in relation to festivals. These results will be related to what motivates Generation Z festival-goers in the context of festivals in Ireland. Identifying these factors will therefore contribute to answering the research question of the current study as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ It is expected that festival organisers would be interested in the elements that relate to Attendance and Event Anticipation.

4.6.5.1 Attendance

The findings relating to Attendance have been addressed under Objective 1. The findings relating to Attendance will be re-summarised here. Firstly, the proposed SEM model accounts for 45% of the variance in Attendance with particular reference to the following combinations of statistically significant predictor variables: Flow, Event Attractions and Event Anticipation. Each of these three predictors demonstrated an almost equal moderate magnitude impact on Attendance. In terms of direct effects, Flow, Event Anticipation and Event Attractions were each found to have a significant direct effect on Attendance. In terms of indirect effects, Flow was firstly found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. Secondly, Flow was found to mediate the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. Next, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. Fourthly, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. Finally, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance.
4.6.5.2 Event Anticipation

In relation to Event Anticipation, the constructs relating to Event Anticipation were outlined under objective 1. These findings will be summarised here. Firstly, the model explains 50% of the variance in Event Anticipation with equal reference and magnitude to the following statistically significant predictors; Event Attractions, Known Group Socialisation, Social Capital, External Socialisation, Flow and to a lesser extent, Perceived Popularity. This means that these constructs together have explained 50% of the variance in Event Anticipation. In terms of direct effects, Event Attractions, External Socialisation, Known Group Socialisation, Social Capital, Perceived Popularity and Flow were each found to have a direct effect on Event Anticipation. Another finding in relation to Event Anticipation related to the moderation interaction, wherein it was found that Inhibition strengthens the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation.

4.6.5.3 Qualitative Findings

When participants were asked about this in the qualitative data collection stage, there were varied responses.

4.6.5.3.1 More than just headliners

Participant 1 suggests that there are elements of the festival this participant is mainly associated with which have gained importance and with that, music elements of the festivals have dwindled slightly in terms of importance:

“…campsites, toilets, access, price, all of those things have become more important…and the general atmosphere and the vibe and the actual line-up has become slightly less important…” – Participant 1

Participant 1 - Music Festival Organiser, was asked what do they believe that festival organisers need to do to cater for the market of Generation Z festival-goers in the near future and answered:

“…I think you have to to develop the offering you know I think if your…if your if your offering is solely based on your headliners…you know on your on your line up I think it is a pretty difficult business model amm so what you’ve got to do is to create something that’s either quite niche so like you know something that there’s just a smaller amount of people are into it but you
know...you directly attract them or in the case of something like (extract removed for confidentiality reasons), amm it’s creating that that safe space that easy access that you know amm campsites, toilets, showers, you know that’s and that and that ticket price…” – Participant 1

This finding will be discussed in detail Chapter 5.

4.6.5.3.2 Facilities

The range of facilities available at festivals is of huge importance. As Participant 1 commented, this generation watch Coachella on live stream and their expectations in terms of production have grown.

“…yeah because like they’re just smarter you know what I mean and they see like they you know they go onto they watch Coachella live stream…and they don’t expect to go to (specific festival) and get the same production as Coachella but they would be very annoyed if they walked in and the main stage was the back of a truck…so you know there’s there’s a balance you’ve gotta find a (inaudible), they expect better production, better tents, better facilities, amm and like yeah and if you get it wrong it can go viral pretty quickly” – Participant 1

Participant 1 referred to the importance of:

“…creating that that safe space that easy access that you know amm campsites, toilets, showers, you know…” – Participant 1

Participant 3 mentioned how the market needs to be upped to cater for this generation’s needs and wants in the near future:

“…I think amm... probably need to up the market in terms of you know I know that on site so we’ve started to provide water for... you know that you’ve water refill points they’re really big into that they’ll bring their bottle and they’ll want it refilled amm we certainly didn’t have in (specific festival) places to charge our phone you know... we didn’t have places and that’s really important they don’t want their phone to die...you know they want to keep so I think looking at stuff like that…” – Participant 3

In addition, Participant 3 commented on various other aspects of the festival experience that Generation Z like or would avail of if it was on offer:

“…they like the wood burning stove for the pizza you know this is not just like what was shoved at me you know pizza ...they know what they like and they but also they like the fun stuff they like to go to get some candy floss you know and it’s emm if you have somebody there like I said you know that does, if it’s a residential festival so that they’re staying over night you know that does amm ehh you know hair blow drying and and all of that stuff they’ll avail of it...no question” – Participant 3

Participant 3 commented that a festival that this participant is associated with, had to include a vegan food vendor as vegetarian wasn’t sufficient:
“…we had to go vegan as well…which we never had to do before you know…vegetarian is not enough…” – Participant 3

This finding will be discussed in more detail in the Discussion and Analysis chapter. Overall, this section identified a number of elements that may contribute to targeting and catering for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers and contributed to answering the research question of the current study, which was as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’.

4.6.6 Conclusion

Section 4.6 outlined the main findings of the current study, objective by objective. A number of findings emerged which contributed to meeting the five objectives of the study, and therefore contributed to answering the overall research goal of the current study, which is to identify the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. A selection of these findings will be discussed at length in chapter 5, Discussion and Analysis.

4.7 Limitations

This chapter identified the results of the current study, which have been outlined in relation to each of the objectives in order, in section 4.6. The main results will be discussed at length in the chapter 5, Discussion and Analysis. The current study did have a small number of limitations and those relating to the data analysis will be outlined in this section.

Firstly, the results of two different demographic questions could not be analysed. The first demographic variable which was measured and which could later not be used related to the highest level of educational attainment that each respondent had achieved. Participants who completed the survey were asked to tick the highest level of educational attainment they have achieved. These levels ranged from ‘Level 3 Junior Certificate/GCSE/O Levels/Equivalent’ to ‘Level 10 Doctoral Degree/Higher Doctorate’. Unfortunately it was decided that this question may not have captured education levels accurately, as respondents in some universities/colleges may have chosen ‘Level 4/5 Leaving Certificate/A Levels/Equivalent’ as their highest level of educational attainment, even if they
are in their final year of their degree. This may have occurred if their educational institution doesn't offer a ‘Level 6 Advanced or Higher Certificate’ or a ‘Level 7 Ordinary Bachelor Degree’, solely Level 8 Honours Bachelor Degrees. If this is the case, then it’s possible that participants may believe that they have attained a Level 4/5 Leaving Certificate/A Levels/Equivalent so far. For example, one participant wrote in the comment box 'Final Year of Bachelors Degree' but at the same time chose ‘Level 4/5 Leaving Certificate/A Levels/Equivalent’ as the highest level of educational attainment achieved, despite having completed sufficient time in third level to have reached final year.

In IoTs or institutions wherein students can opt to take a ‘Level 6 Advanced or Higher Certificate’ or a ‘Level 7 Ordinary Bachelor Degree’, then final year students could choose this as their highest level of educational attainment achieved to date or alternatively, as above, they could choose ‘Level 4/5 Leaving Certificate/A Levels/Equivalent’. For those respondents who chose ‘Level 4/5 Leaving Certificate/A Levels/Equivalent’, it's impossible to decipher if they have just completed their ‘Level 4/5 Leaving Certificate/A Levels/Equivalent’ attainment, or if they are in their final year in college. Two respondents answered this question instead of choosing an option, and they were categorised as having reached Level 7 initially. Subsequently it was decided not to utilise the data emerging from this survey question given the assumptions involved in categorising participants without being completely certain of their status.

Another demographic variable asked participants to tick any number of the following options which are relevant to them. The options included: ‘working on a full-time basis’, ‘working on a part-time basis’, ‘unemployed’ or ‘in full-time education’. This survey question was flawed. For example, some respondents said that they were ‘in full-time education’, some said that they were ‘unemployed’ and ‘in full time education’. It is difficult to decipher whether those who said the latter are in the same category as those in the former category. In addition, this is the only question wherein participants were asked to ‘tick as many as are relevant to you’ so it may be the case that participants failed to see this and just chose the option that was most relevant to them or that took up the majority of their time. It was decided not to utilise the data emerging from this survey question.
Another limitation relates to the fact that this survey asked participants to ‘Please think about the last festival you went to, or the festival from which you have the most vivid memories. Please respond to the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.’. For some of these festivals, it was difficult to categorise them by type. For example, ‘Indie’ was named as a specific festival by respondents, but it was impossible to say whether this related to Indiependence Music & Arts Festival in Cork or IndieCork Film Festival. Thus, ‘Indie’ or variations of same were categorised as ‘other’.

Another limitation relates to the fact that the advertisements for the survey featured a music festival image (see Appendix A and B). This may have mainly caught the attention of people interested in music festivals and possibly even acted to dissuade individuals that are uninterested in music festivals from participating in the research. At first glance, it may seem that the research is investigating music festivals only, as opposed to all types of festivals and it’s possible that using imagery from a number of different types of festivals may have resulted in a wider range of festivals being specified by Generation Z festival-goers in the survey.

In addition, before being asked to respond to each set of constructs’ items in the survey, respondents were asked to ‘Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind’. However, holding a specific festival in mind was not necessarily relevant to the items measuring ‘Inhibition’, ‘Social Desirability’, and ‘Event Anticipation’. In addition, ‘Event Anticipation’ could relate to anticipation about future festivals, but as this aforementioned instruction was presented before the items were presented, it can only be assumed that participants answered it thinking about the anticipation they experienced at the festival they held in mind.

The current study’s survey asked participants to retrospectively recall a number of elements of their experience at a festival which they initially specified that they would keep in mind when answering the subsequent items within the survey. Participants were asked to ‘Please respond to the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind’. Before each set of statements, it reminded participants to “Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind”. Where this was irrelevant, it should have been left out, for example, before the set of items relating to ‘Event
Anticipation’, which relate to thinking about future festivals, before the set of items relating to Social Desirability, as this wasn’t necessarily related to the festival, it was used as a measure to remove any bias from the responses if any existed. In the case of Event Anticipation, the survey was essentially asking participants to recall their experience at a festival and then recall their thoughts about the future at that time. It would be difficult for survey respondents to recall retrospectively their future thoughts in a time that has passed. Thus, it cannot be deciphered whether participants did indeed answer this bearing their retrospective feelings of Event Anticipation at the festival which they specified in mind, or whether the instruction before the items was ignored by participants and the items measured their current Event Anticipation relating to future festivals. This is also the case in relation to the construct ‘Inhibition’. It’s impossible to decipher if participants answered the set of items related to Inhibition taking into account their feelings of Inhibition at the time of responding to the survey or if they were recalling their feelings of inhibition at the time of their festival experience.

Another limitation was related to the fact that although rich data emerged from the qualitative interviews in the current study, a greater sample size at the qualitative data collection stage may have led to additional findings and greater support for each finding.

Finally, the sample size was deemed too small in some groups, where it was intended to carry out a comparison of same. For example, initially it was intended to compare the responses of participants based on the type of festival they attended, based on their education levels, based on their education and employment status, based on their gender and based on their age. Groups were compared based on age (young/old) and gender (male/female) only.

4.8 Conclusion
This chapter has presented the findings of the quantitative analysis carried out as part of this research, as well as the qualitative findings, in order to meet the objectives of this research. By meeting these objectives, the intention was to answer the overall research question, which is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’. The findings have been presented in relation to each objective set out at the initial
stages of this research, without reference to existing literature. The following chapters will discuss the findings of this study in light of previous findings, key points of note for festival stakeholders will be identified, and recommendations for further investigation will be made.
Discussion and Analysis

5.1 Introduction

The overall goal of the current research is to answer the research question of the current study, which is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ This chapter aims to explore the main findings, relating to the overall goal of the research, emerging from the research findings outlined in the previous chapter. The Discussion and Analysis chapter aims to outline the key findings in light of what is already known about these findings, i.e., the current literature, and identify areas wherein more research may be required. This chapter will also identify key take-away points for festival organisers, both those who organise music festivals and those who organise community festivals, with regards to Generation Z. The current study is the first of its kind in Ireland. There is limited research investigating the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z in Ireland, and there appears to be a dearth of research investigating the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z in the context of festivals in Ireland. The current study’s goal is to identify the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. This research is timely as Generation Z, who were born between the years of 1995 and 2009 (e.g., Goh and Lee, 2018), are graduating into adulthood and are starting to become financially independent. It is hoped that this study will help ensure the continued success of the festival industry, with this market of festival-goers. Therefore, the results of the current study will bridge a gap in the festival motivation literature as well as the existing literature focusing on Generation Z in Ireland and will be of benefit to industry stakeholders also. The current chapter is laid out so that the main findings for each separate objective are identified. The key findings are discussed in the same order as they have been identified in the Findings chapter, chapter 4, objective by objective. However, although a selection of the findings that emerged in chapter 4 will be discussed in the current chapter, the current chapter will not discuss every finding that emerged in the previous chapter. Please note that some of the qualitative interview extracts have been edited to ensure interviewees’ confidentiality is maintained. An example relates to the fact that some festival names have been replaced with (specific festival) in some areas. There are a number of examples of these
replacements in the following sections. These are not errors; instead such replacements have been implemented for confidentiality reasons.

**5.2 Objective 1: To determine the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.**

To present the results relating to the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, those results which were considered the most notable findings related to Attendance and Event Anticipation will be discussed. By meeting objective one, a contribution to the overall research question of the current study will be made, as the variables that relate to why Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland go to festivals, and why they look forward to festivals, will be revealed.

**5.2.1 Variance explained by the Structural Equation Model (SEM)**

The SEM model accounted for a significant amount of variance, in terms of explaining the variance in Attendance and Event Anticipation among the sample of Generation Z that participated in the current study.

**a). Attendance**

The proposed SEM model accounts for 45% of the variance in Attendance with particular reference to the following combinations of statistically significant predictor variables: Flow, Event Attractions and Event Anticipation. Each of these three predictors demonstrated an almost equal moderate magnitude impact on Attendance. This means that these constructs together have explained 45% of the variance in Attendance. The other proposed predictors of Attendance, namely Perceived Popularity and Social Capital, revealed an approximate zero prediction effect. Thus, the findings relating to the motives of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland in terms of attending festivals, reveal that the variables of note are Flow, Event Attractions and Event Anticipation. It may be the prospect of experiencing Flow that contributes to motivating Generation Z to attend given festivals in Ireland. In addition, it could be the appeal of the prospective Event Attractions that are going to be present at a given festival that contributes to motivating Generation Z to attend festivals in an Irish context. Similarly, it may be the sense of anticipation and looking forward to the festival in itself that contributes to motivating Generation Z festival-goers to attend a given festival or festivals in general. These are all merely possibilities, they are not definitive answers, as the
specific relationships between these three variables and Attendance warrant further investigation.

A number of studies exist pertaining to the motivations of festival-goers. However, it appears that the motives of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland have not been investigated prior to the current study. Kim, Uysal and Chen’s (2001) study found that event and festival organisers proposed that the following dimensions related to attendee motives: “Social/Leisure, Event Novelty, Family Togetherness, Escape and Curiosity” (Kim, Uysal and Chen, 2001, p.132). These dimensions explained approximately 71.3% of the variance. Other motives that have previously emerged in the literature are firstly, the opportunity to experience family togetherness (e.g., Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993; Duran and Hamarat, 2014; Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004), variations of escape (e.g., Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004; Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993), cultural exploration (e.g., Duran and Hamarat, 2014; Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004; Crompton and McKay, 1997), variations of excitement/thrills (e.g., Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993; Formica and Uysal, 1996), and socialisation or slight deviations of this construct (e.g., Park, Reisinger and Kang, 2008; Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004; Crompton and McKay, 1997; Formica and Uysal, 1996; Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993).

The proposed SEM model explains 45% of the variance in Attendance with particular reference to the following combinations of statistically significant predictor variables: Flow, Event Attractions and Event Anticipation. Firstly, Event Attractions are all of those elements of a festival that appeal to an attendee, and this was used as a control variable and so it was expected that this variable would explain some of the variance in Attendance. Further research is warranted to investigate whether the opportunity to experience Flow is a motive of festival attendees. The same can be said for Event Anticipation. Further investigation is needed to see if the motive of experiencing Event Anticipation, i.e., being motivated at the prospect of having something to look forward to, can be considered a generalised motive for this generation. If so, festival organisers should note this and endeavour to apply marketing strategies that engender high levels of Event Anticipation among ticket-buyers, to secure greater Attendance levels.
b). Event Anticipation

Secondly, the model explains 50% of the variance in Event Anticipation with equal reference and magnitude to the following statistically significant predictors; Event Attractions, Known Group Socialisation, Social Capital, External Socialisation, Flow and to a lesser extent, Perceived Popularity. This means that these constructs together have explained 50% of the variance in Event Anticipation. It appears that the constructs that relate to Event Anticipation have been investigated to a much lower degree. It may be the case that the findings of this research will provide novel and innovative findings on what factors explain the variance in Event Anticipation. Additional findings, including direct effects, indirect effects and moderation interaction effects in the context of Event Anticipation will be discussed in the coming paragraphs.

5.2.2 Findings in relation to the festival type specified

In relation to the festivals specified by participants in the self-administered online survey by Generation Z, the majority of respondents specified music festivals, when asked to specify the festival they would have in mind when responding to the statements which followed in the survey. Participants were initially asked to think about the last festival they went to or the festival from which they have the most vivid memories. They were then asked to respond to the statements to follow, with the specific festival they attended in mind. Various festivals were specified and were categorised as follows: 60% of the festivals specified were music festivals. 14% did not fit within any of the festival categories used for this research. The next most popular festival type was “tourist-tempter” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) festivals at 19%, “home-grown” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) festivals were next at 5% and finally just 2% specified a festival in the “big-bang” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultsos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) festival category.

While it’s not possible to say indefinitely, this could suggest that music festivals are the most popular type of festival among Generation Z attendees aged between eighteen and twenty-three years old in Ireland. This finding provides cause to question why it is that this type of festival is the most popular type among the sample that participated in this research. Is it that other types of
festivals, such as those taking place in communities all around Ireland, that do not predominantly feature music acts, are not catering for this age-group in some ways? Further investigation is required here to explore why it is that music festivals seem to be the most popular category of festival among this sample of Generation Z festival-goers. It appears that there are currently no easily-accessible statistics pertaining to the popularity of different types of festivals among Generation Z. Additional research would be warranted here to investigate this and to see if the findings of this study are replicated and generalisable to the wider population of Generation Z in Ireland. If so, it would be of worth to see why it is that festivals, such as those of the “home-grown” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302), “tourist-tempter” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) or “big-bang” (O’Sullivan and Jackson, 2002 cited in Skoultos and Tsartas, 2009, p.302) categories, are not more popular among this cohort. Festival organisers of these types of festivals may find this information of use in order to try to increase the appeal of non-music festivals among this group. Overall, this finding contributes to identifying Generation Z festival-goers’ behaviour, in that it reveals the most popular type of festival that they tend to attend. Although it is somewhat related to motivation in that the finding reveals that they are more motivated to attend music festivals, this finding fails to explain what it is that contributes to motivating them to do so, thus further investigation is required to investigate this.

5.2.3 Findings in relation to Attendance and Event Anticipation

5.2.3.1 Direct Effects: Attendance

a). Flow -> Attendance

The most important relationship that emerged in the direct effect findings relating to Attendance was that of the direct effect of Flow on Attendance. Thus, it is proposed from the findings that Flow has a relationship with Generation Z’s motivation to attend festivals. Thus, this finding contributes to identifying a motive of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, which is one element of the research question of the current study. As described in the literature, Getz (2008, p.414) suggests that those who are “highly ‘involved’” may have a greater likelihood of experiencing Flow. Getz (2008, p.414) associates the experience of
Flow with the highest levels of “engagement” which can be experienced. The experience of Flow is also described by Jackson and Marsh (1996). To quote Jackson and Marsh (1996), it is proposed that: “[w]hen in flow, a person becomes totally involved in an activity and experiences a number of positive experiential characteristics, including freedom from self-consciousness and great enjoyment of the process. Flow is an intrinsically enjoyable state and is accompanied by an order in consciousness whereby the person experiences clarity of goals and knowledge of performance, complete concentration, feelings of control, and feelings of being totally in tune with the performance” (Jackson and Marsh, 1996, p.18). It is proposed by Getz (2008) that those who design events may wish to make provisions so that the attendees of their events have the experience of Flow. It would seem that Flow is associated here with having a positive experience, thus, the finding in this study that Flow has a direct positive impact on Attendance is in line with what has been suggested about Flow in the literature.

5.2.3.2 Indirect Effects: Attendance

a). External Socialisation -> Flow -> Attendance

In terms of indirect effects, a number of mediating effects were found to exist among the variables measured in this study. Significantly, it was shown that Flow mediates the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. External Socialisation is thus impacting upon Flow which in turn impacts upon Attendance and Flow contributes to explaining why External Socialisation impacts upon Attendance. This finding helps to contribute to the overall research question, in that it reveals that External Socialisation is related to Attendance and this relationship is mediated by Flow. External Socialisation thus acts as an indirect motive of Generation Z festival-goers in terms of their attendance at festivals, with Flow mediating the relationship between the two constructs.

A study by Uysal, Gahan and Martin (1993) investigated what motivated attendees to attend a Corn Festival in South Carolina in 1991. This study sample consisted of different generations to Generation Z (Generation Z was not yet born in 1991). It was found that 63% of variance in “event motivation behavior” (Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993, p.8) was explained by five dimensions (Uysal,
Gahan and Martin, 1993, p.8), namely “Escape”, “Excitement and Thrills”, “Event Novelty”, “Socialization” and “Family Togetherness” (Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993, p.8), thus, Socialisation has been found to relate to Attendance in previous literature. Interestingly, socialisation as a motive was found in this study to be higher for festival visitors attending on Friday as opposed to Saturday (Uysal, Gahan and Martin, 1993).

Further research would be recommended to investigate if Socialisation scores differ among attendees of different types of festivals. As the sample size in the current study was too small, it was deemed inappropriate to conduct comparisons of the results of those Generation Z festival-goers who specified different festival types. External Socialisation emerged among five other motivation dimensions in Crompton and McKay’s (1997) study. It is suggested that combined with two other studies, that of Mohr et al. (1993 cited in Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.438) and Uysal, Gahan and Martin (1993), “aggregate findings of these three studies suggest that six domains should be incorporated on a festival motivations instrument: cultural exploration, novelty/regression, recover equilibrium (rest and relaxation/escape), known-group socialization, external interaction/socialization, and family togetherness (enhancing kinship relationships)” (Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.438). The fact that Crompton and McKay (1997) suggest that External Socialisation should be included in any motivational instrument that is developed shows that its importance in relation to Attendance has been already indicated in the literature and the findings of this study are in line with this. In Lee’s (2000) study, External Socialisation accounted for 5.2% of the total variance explained by the underlying dimensions.

All of these studies highlight the existence of Socialisation in established event/festival motivation literature and this is in line with the finding that External Socialisation was found to have a relationship with motivation to attend in this study. Further research would be warranted to investigate the impact of Flow which mediates this relationship. This is an innovative finding in this research.

*b). Event Attractions -> Flow -> Attendance*

Flow was also found to mediate the relationship between Event Attractions and
Attendance. Event Attractions was included in this study as a control variable and it was expected that it would have a relationship with Attendance. This finding confirms what was expected pre-analysis and whilst the relationship is mediated by Flow, the finding identifies Event Attractions as a motivating influence, in terms of event attendance, of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, thus contributing to answering the research question of the current study. Previous studies have suggested that Event Attractions is a motive of attendees, thus linking it indirectly with ‘Attendance’, as it is measured in the current study. In Lee’s (2000) study, the goal was to compare the motives of Asian and Caucasian attendees of a Cultural Expo taking place in South Korea. In a literature review carried out by Lee (2000), it is suggested that across the literature referenced in Lee’s (2000) literature review “23 to 24 motivation items with 5 to 6 factors appear to be common” (Lee, 2000, p.171), comprising “‘socialization’, ‘family togetherness’, ‘event novelty’, ‘escape’, ‘excitement/thrills’, ‘cultural exploration’, ‘event attractions’ and ‘entertainment’” (Lee, 2000, p.171). The fact that ‘event attractions’ is included in this set signifies its relationship to motivations to attend festivals within the literature. The finding in this research is therefore in line with this suggestion within the literature. Within Lee’s (2000) study, a factor analysis revealed seven dimensions, among these was ‘Event Attractions’ and together the seven dimensions explained almost 65% of the overall variance. ‘Event Attractions’ itself represented 4.3% of the variance explained. It is suggested that this same factor has been labelled “event excitement” in alternative research (Lee, 2000, p.174).

Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004) conducted research with four goals, one of which was to delineate what motivated attendees to attend the “2000 World Culture Expo” (Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004, p.64), with a “factor analysis” (Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004, p.64). In Lee, Lee and Wicks’ (2004) study, Event Attractions was representative of just over 9% of the explained variance. In all, six factors (“Cultural exploration”, “Family togetherness”, “Novelty”, “Escape (recover equilibrium)”, “Event attractions” and “Socialization” (Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004, p.66)) resulted in 61.9% of the variance being explained (Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004). The relationship between Flow and Attendance has already been outlined in section 5.2.3.1 (a) and the literature supporting the relationship
between Flow and Attendance as found in the current study has been discussed.

c). Event Attractions -> Event Anticipation -> Attendance

Another significant mediation effect is that of Event Anticipation mediating the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. This finding emphasises that Event Attractions has a motivating influence upon Attendance, and in this case, the relationship between the two constructs is mediated by Event Anticipation. This finding contributes toward identifying what the motivations of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland are, as it reveals a motivating influence of Event Attractions upon Attendance, with this motivating influence being mediated by Event Anticipation. Therefore, this finding contributes to answering on element of the current study’s research question. As discussed previously, existing literature has found a relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance, in that Event Attractions has been found to be an underlying dimension of motivation (e.g., Lee, 2000; Lee, Lee and Wicks, 2004). As discussed earlier, further investigation is needed to see if Event Anticipation can be considered a generalised motive for this generation and if so, festival organisers should note this and endeavour to apply marketing strategies to increase or promise the experience of Event Anticipation to encourage greater Attendance levels. Event Anticipation was included in this research to have an alternative dependent variable to Attendance and the items related to Event Anticipation were newly developed.

d). External Socialisation -> Event Anticipation -> Attendance

Finally, in terms of mediation effects, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. This finding again highlights External Socialisation as a motivating influence upon Attendance, with this relationship being mediated in this case by Event Anticipation. Thus, this finding contributes to answering the research question of the current study as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ The relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance in the current available literature has been discussed in previous paragraphs (5.2.3.2 (a)). In a similar vein to the finding that Event Anticipation mediates the positive relationship between Known Group
Socialisation and Attendance, Event Anticipation may be involved here in that attendees look forward to the opportunity to meet new people and this in turn has an impact on their likelihood to attend a given festival. The mediation effect of Event Anticipation warrants further investigation, as the aforementioned possibility is by no means definitive.

e). **Known Group Socialisation -> Event Anticipation -> Attendance**

As mentioned in the above section, another mediation effect of importance is the finding that Event Anticipation mediates the positive relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance. Thus, Known Group Socialisation appears to have a motivating influence upon Attendance, with Event Anticipation mediating this relationship. Thus, this finding contributes to answering the research question of the current study, that is, ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ The measure ‘Known Group Socialisation’ aimed to capture if Generation Z festival-goers attend festivals to strengthen their current connections.

In Lee’s (2000) research, Known Group Socialisation was found to account for 3.6% of the total variance in “motivations” (Lee, 2000, p.173). Socialisation, or a variation of same, which is an umbrella term for socialising as a motive in general, has been found in a wide spectrum of motivational research, such as in Lee, Lee and Wicks (2004), Park Reisinger and Kang (2008) (one of the seven dimensions that emerged in this study was “Meeting People” (p. 174)), Crompton and McKay (1997) (“external interaction/socialization” (Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.434) and “known-group socialization” (Crompton and McKay, 1997, p.434) emerged as separate dimensions in this study), Formica and Uysal (1996) and Uysal, Gahan and Martin (1993). The finding that Known Group Socialisation has a relationship with Attendance is in line with some of the available literature, such as Lee (2000) and Crompton and McKay (1997). Some of this literature may have used a variation for the term, e.g., “known-group socialization” (Lee, 2000, p.173).

The finding that Event Anticipation mediates this relationship may be of interest to those operating in the festival industry. It suggests that Generation Z may look forward to attending festivals because of the opportunity to strengthen their current connections and thus, are more likely to attend. Therefore, festival
organisers should note this and ensure that groups of friends are facilitated in socialising together. One such example is the provision of facilities that ensures that they do not need to split up. Festival organisers may be interested in capitalising on this finding in some way. For example, festival organisers could encourage attendance among groups by incentivising them with group offers on tickets, which, in addition, may require less administration than selling several single tickets. This could possibly mean that tickets will sell out faster and consequently present the festival in a positive light, and possibly confer unplanned event exclusivity.

5.2.3 Direct Effects: Event Anticipation

a). Event Attractions -> Event Anticipation
Event Attractions was found to have a small significant direct effect on Event Anticipation. The literature pertaining to the impact of Event Attractions on Attendance has been outlined in previous paragraphs. There appears to be no existing research that has examined the relationship between Event Attractions and Event Anticipation. Further research is warranted here as Event Anticipation has been found to be one of three predictors of Attendance in this research, which together explain 45% of the total variance. Thus, relationships that may exist between Event Anticipation and other constructs are also of relevance in answering the research question of the current study, specifically, in identifying the motivations of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

b). External Socialisation/Known Group Socialisation -> Event Anticipation
Those constructs which were found to have significant but small direct effects on Event Anticipation were External Socialisation and Known Group Socialisation. Again, the relationships between External Socialisation and Attendance and Known Group Socialisation and Attendance have been described in previous paragraphs. Research has not been found by the researcher that has pertained to the relationships between External Socialisation or Known Group Socialisation and Event Anticipation. As above, further research is warranted here as Event Anticipation has been found to be one of three predictors of Attendance in this research, which together explain 45% of the total variance. Thus, relationships that may exist between Event Anticipation and other constructs are of relevance
in answering the research question of the current study, specifically the element relating to the identification of the motivations of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

5.2.3.4 Moderation Interaction
The findings reveal that Inhibition strengthens the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation. The quantitative analysis suggests that for those respondents with higher Inhibition scores, the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation is stronger. This is an important finding relating to a specific group of this market whom experience higher Inhibition. Consequently, marketing campaigns ought to develop targeted strategies towards those members of Generation Z for whom additional benefits are conferred as suggested by this moderated relationship. In terms of answering the research question, again, further research would be of merit here as Event Anticipation is among three predictors of Attendance in the current research, which together explain 45% of the total variance. Thus, relationships that may exist between Event Anticipation and other constructs are of relevance in answering the research question of the current study, specifically the element relating to the identification of the motivations of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

5.3 Objective 2: To evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how this generation interacts with festivals in Ireland.
As described previously, Generation Z are the first generation to have lived in a world where the Internet has always existed (Prensky, 2001 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104). In addition, YSI and Amárach Research (2019b) found that four hours was the mean quantity of time which Generation Z respondents in Ireland used their smartphones for each day. Such previous findings necessitated an evaluation on the extent to which technology shapes how this generation interacts with festivals in Ireland. Thus, the findings related to objective two were intended to contribute to answering both elements of the research question of the study, that is, revealing findings relating to the motivations and the behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers. Social Capital will be the construct in focus for this section. Social Capital is a concept put forward by Yeoman (2013) who suggests that there is a “new form of currency by which degrees of personal
success can be measured” (Yeoman, 2013, p.256). It is “our accomplishments and talents and wider interests” that make up our Social Capital. Where once our consumption of products may have defined our “social status” (Yeoman, 2013, p.256), in recent times, Social Capital has a part to play in how we present ourselves in our social world. For example “…it is the festival that you attended or the book that you have read that is strong demonstration of one’s social capital” (Yeoman 2013, p.256). Festivals possibly then facilitate the acquisition of Social Capital, as suggested in the statement, by Yeoman (2013), in the previous sentence. Given that Generation Z are the first generation to have been born into a world where the Internet has always existed (Prensky, 2001 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104), measuring this generation’s tendency to acquire Social Capital at festivals via social media was considered to be timely.

5.3.1 Direct Effects: Social Capital
The SEM model revealed that Social Capital had a direct impact upon Event Anticipation in the current study. There are a number of possible reasons for this. It could be that Generation Z look forward to the acquisition of Social Capital via the experiences they are about to be part of, at a festival that they attend. It could also be that they look forward to the fall out from the Social Capital that they attain, such as ‘likes’ or ‘followers’ or general traction that their experiences gain on social media. These suggestions are just that - simply suggestions, and are by no means definitive conclusions, thus, further research would be warranted to fully explain this finding. Yeoman (2013, p.256) predicted, “we should expect more personal portfolios of event experiences accumulated” in the subsequent years since his paper was written and this could be said to be related with what was found in the qualitative findings. Participant 1 makes reference to festival-goers previously (four or five years ago) bringing burner phones, whose phone batteries would last for a whole weekend, whereas now festival-goers bring their smartphones, as they want to be able to post on social media channels Instagram and Snapchat. This finding directly contributes to answering the research question of the current study, in that it identifies behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers. Although Interview Participants 1 and 3 acknowledged that the capturing and sharing of experiences is part of Generation Z’s festival experience, Participant 1 suggested that it may be the case that sometimes people
attend other festivals so that they can post about it on Instagram, but this Participant doesn’t think that Generation Z attend the festival that this participant is mainly associated with, solely for that reason. Participant 3 also commented that it’s a big part of the experience, but not a main motive for attendance. These findings are important in potentially ruling out or putting less emphasis on the possibility of Social Capital as a motivating factor for Generation Z for attending festivals. This may be in line with the assertions of Perron-Brault et al. (2020, p.10), who suggest: “…while it is true that festival-goers may be motivated to attend an event in order to publicly display their attendance, share their stylish outfit and exhibit their friendships on social networks, we argue that this constitutes one of the components of the “socialization” dimension of motivation and not a new dimension per se” (Perron-Brault et al., 2020, p.10). Perron-Brault et al. (2020) suggest that activities similar to those which comprise the construct Social Capital in the current study should not be considered a motivational dimension independently. Instead, they should be considered to fall under the motivational dimension related to Socialisation.

The finding that Social Capital had a direct effect on Event Anticipation has not been investigated previously. However in Fáilte Ireland’s Social Energisers report published in 2017, it was identified that there is a specific market of tourists who do engage in the sharing of their experiences via social media. This市场 look for unusual experiences - the more unusual their experience is, the more positive they view it as - and they want to show this off after their trip, with Fáilte Ireland (2017) suggesting that this has the effect of “reinforcing their own self-image” (p.13). Further research is required to delve into this relationship further and investigate the underlying dimensions of this relationship. Whilst Fáilte Ireland (2017) suggest that destinations ought to push visitors to capture and post imagery of what they have seen and been present for on social media platforms, the same could be said to festival organisers. In order to facilitate more user-generated content, there should be Wi-Fi that works well and does not cost the user any money as well as “lots of photo opportunity prompts which encourage social media conversation” (p.14), as per Fáilte Ireland’s (2017) report.
5.3.2 Social Capital and Flow

In the qualitative interviews, although it emerged that the acquisition of Social Capital is part of one’s experience at festivals, it seems that while this may distract or deplete the level of engagement, Generation Z are still able to remain engaged to a high extent at festivals, despite this.

“They’re lesser they’re lesser engaged because of the amount of time they spend on their phone I think it’s you know they’re still engaged to a high extent at the gig because you know… (inaudible) they’re immersed in it and they’re there so but less so (inaudible)” – Participant 1

This may be due to the fact that they have not lived in a world wherein the Internet has not existed (Prensky, 2001 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104) and thus, may have evolved so that they are able to both stay engaged (albeit to a lesser extent) in the experience taking place before them, while also engaging with technology. This is an important finding relating to the behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland and contributes directly to answering the research question of the current study, relating to the behaviours of Generation Z.

Participant 2 also discussed how perhaps looking at presence and technology as either or, is no longer an accurate view to take. This participant suggested that presence and technology can complement each other, as opposed to them being distinct from each other, as technology:

“can also enhance and give an afterglow of presence” – Participant 2

This is an interesting reflection on presence in a world where technology plays a role in our everyday lives. Instead of seeing technology as being an antidote to presence, this reflection suggests that technology shouldn’t be seen as competing with presence but as complementing presence.

Participant 1 and Participant 3 made reference to the fact that Generation Z may watch their experiences through their phones:

“...I remember looking down and there’s no one watching it through their phone which you usually see...you go to anything, (specific experience) or whatever people are watching stuff through their phone this is now they are 18 – 24 this group and they’re dancing and they’re dancing there’s no phones out and I thought that was really really interesting actually am because it does play a huge part...” – Participant 3
“...there is a definite element of like you know would you not just put your phone away and enjoy it you know or like you know you are you want to put something on Instagram, great, take one photo...and leave it at that and not a you know you know 400 image story amm where you’re literally you’re watching your living life through the screen of your phone” – Participant 1

This again is an important finding in relation to the research question of the current study. This finding identifies a behaviour of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, that is, the level of engagement that Generation Z have with their phones at festivals is such that, as Participant 3 suggests, it is unusual not to see people watching a live experience through their phones. However, this is not to say that their entire sense of being present is being wholly compromised if they do so, as Participant 1 suggests that they are still highly engaged despite their interaction with technology:

“they’re lesser they’re lesser engaged because of the amount of time they spend on their phone I think it’s you know they’re still engaged to a high extent at the gig because you know... (inaudible) they’re immersed in it and they’re there so but less so (inaudible)” – Participant 1

The finding that Generation Z remain engaged in the experience before them, as described by Participant 1, despite their level of interaction with their phones, is another important finding in relation to the research question. Their engagement with the experience before them remains intact, although to a lesser extent. The finding that their level of engagement is not wholly compromised could be seen to be a characteristic of their behaviour, as opposed to a behaviour in and of itself. This contributes to answering the element of the research question pertaining to behaviour.

5.3.3 Comparison of groups: Social Capital

Gender differences in terms of social media use and the accumulation of Social Capital also emerged. First of all, a comparison of groups based on each of the constructs revealed that just one construct had significantly different scores between male and female participants. This construct was Social Capital. It was found that females had significantly higher scores than males in their propensity to accumulate Social Capital at festivals. Participant 1 suggested that Instagram and Snapchat are more popular among females than males:
“… it’s you know it’s probably ninety per cent plus Instagram and Snapchat with with girls…and it’s maybe you know 60% Instagram Snapchat with…with boys and they’re still Twitter and Facebook you know a little bit more…amm it seems to be that the Twitter because we’ve spoken to these people and the lads are on Twitter because it’s a it’s a place for sport…” – Participant 1

It may be that Snapchat and Instagram are the platforms that are considered most appropriate for sharing experiences, and this could account for females’ higher scores on Social Capital, and these platforms just happen to be more popular among females, therefore accounting for their higher scores in Social Capital. This is merely a suggestion and by no means definitive. Further research is needed to delve into this finding further and to identify the underlying reasons for the significant difference between males and females on this construct. However, the findings in and of themselves relating to the differences between genders in terms of Social Capital scores and the findings relating to the social media channels used by males and females contribute to answering the element of the overall research question relating to the behaviour of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

This finding that Snapchat and Instagram are popular among this generation is in line with that of Anderson and Jiang (2018) whose research focused on those aged between thirteen and seventeen years old. The online self-administered survey disseminated to Generation Z did not enquire about the social media preferences of the sample of Generation Z respondents that participated in the research. Although Youtube was not found in the current study to be suggested one of the most popular social media channels among Generation Z festival-goers, the second and third platforms used by most Generation Z in the research by Anderson and Jiang (2018), namely Instagram and Snapchat, were suggested by two of the qualitative interviewees in the current study to be popular social media channels among this generation. Therefore the findings of this study are in line with that of Anderson and Jiang (2018).

Dolot’s (2018) study suggests that Facebook is the most popular among this age-group, however the study considered Generation Z as those being born from the year 1990, so may not be wholly comparable with the current study’s findings, where Generation Z are suggested to be born from the year 1995. Piper Jaffray (2019) found the most often visited social media channel among
teenagers was Instagram, followed by Snapchat followed by Twitter, and to a lower extent, Facebook and Pinterest. In 2020, Piper Sandler found similar results, with Instagram being the most often visited social media channel, followed by Snapchat, then TikTok. Here, Twitter and Facebook were visited less often than were the preceding three channels (Piper Sandler, 2020). Both of these sets of findings are in line with those of the current study, in terms of being in accordance with the suggestion that Instagram and Snapchat are popular with this generation.

5.4 Objective 3: To appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers' level of attendance and participation at festivals.

The third objective was to appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers’ level of attendance and participation at festivals. By meeting this objective, a contribution would be made to answering the overall research question of the current study, that is, ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’ In this section, the key findings related to Attendance and Flow will be discussed in light of what has already been found in relation to these constructs. It was intended that the key findings of the current study relating to Attendance would contribute to answering the element of the overall research question which related to motivation, whilst the key findings of the current study relating to Flow would contribute to answering the element of the overall research question which related to Generation Z festival-goers’ behaviour.

5.4.1 Attendance

The findings relating to Attendance have been addressed under Objective 1, in section 5.2.3. A number of relationships that emerged in the current study, which relate to Attendance, have been discussed in this section.

5.4.2 Flow

5.4.2.1 Direct Effects: Flow

a). External Socialisation -> Flow

Another important direct effect was the impact of External Socialisation on Flow. Firstly, it may be that the self-administered online survey that asked the
Generation Z respondents about the extent to which they make new connections at festivals may have been interpreted by the sample as being related to making new romantic connections. Whilst two qualitative participants who were associated with festivals didn’t perceive the opportunity to make friends as a very strong motive for Generation Z festival-goers to attend festivals, the mean score for External Socialisation among the sample of Generation Z participants who participated in the self-administered online survey is relatively high at 3.8183. One possible reason for the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Flow may be that when festival-goers are un-self-conscious enough to make new connections at festivals, that they may be more likely to experience Flow, which as above has been defined as when someone “becomes totally involved in an activity and experiences a number of positive experiential characteristics, including freedom from self-consciousness and great enjoyment of the process” (Jackson and Marsh, 1996, p.18). Thus, when they are making new connections, they may be feeling more engaged and present, as opposed to being distracted. It could be that in engaging with someone new in an unconscious manner, a festival-goer becomes more engaged in what is happening in the festival world, or heterotopia, that surrounds them. This is one possibility; however further research is necessary to establish what lies within this relationship, i.e., why External Socialisation has a direct effect upon Flow. Whilst the finding that External Socialisation has a direct impact on Flow does contribute to answering the research question of the current study in relation to behaviour, the underlying reason for this relationship is not explained and thus, the utility of the finding in answering the research question is limited.

b). Event Attractions -> Flow

Event Attractions was found to have a direct impact upon Flow in the current study. This effect size was medium and this was also supported by qualitative findings from Participant 3, however this finding has not emerged previously in the literature. Further study would be warranted to see if this finding is replicated and possibly to delve further into which Event Attractions (i.e., aspects of festival content) have this effect and possibly how this may differ at different festival types. Whilst the finding that Event Attractions has a direct impact on Flow does contribute to answering the research question of the current study in
relation to behaviour, the underlying reason for this relationship is not explained and thus, the utility of the finding in answering the research question is limited.

c). Flow -> Attendance
This finding was already discussed in section 5.2.3.1 Flow was found to have a significant direct effect upon Attendance in the current study and this relationship was discussed in terms of what is already known about Flow and its possible relationship with Attendance.

d). Flow -> Event Anticipation
Flow was found to have a small direct effect upon Event Anticipation and this was supported by qualitative findings from Participant 1, however further research would be worthwhile to investigate both of these constructs and their significance in relation festival motivation, as neither has featured in the existing festival motivation literature.

5.4.2.2 Indirect Effects: Flow

a). External Socialisation -> Flow -> Attendance
In terms of indirect effects, Flow was found to mediate a number of relationships. Significantly, it was shown that Flow mediates the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance. This relationship and current literature in relation to this relationship were discussed in section 5.2.3.2 (a), as was the need for further research regarding the mediation effect of Flow.

b). Event Attractions -> Flow -> Attendance
Flow was also found to mediate the relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance. This relationship has been discussed in section 5.2.3.2 (b), as has the existing literature which pertains to it.

5.4.2.3 Moderation Interaction
In terms of moderation, it was found that Inhibition strengthens the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation. This suggests that at higher
levels of Inhibition, the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation is amplified or strengthened. This finding was described previously in section 5.2.3.4.

5.5. Objective 4: To determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers' behaviour at festivals.

It was intended that by meeting objective four, a contribution would be made to answering the element of the research question relating to behaviour. The research question of the current study is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’.

5.5.1 Generation Z’s positive behaviour

In general, the majority of Generation Z festival-goers were observed to behave well at festivals. This was observed by Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser and Participant 3 – Community Festival Organiser. This finding makes a direct contribution to answering the behaviour element of the research question of the current study, which is as follows: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’. The observations made which were presented in the previous chapter represent positive behaviours in the main. This is noteworthy for festival stakeholders who may be considering producing a festival for this age-group, but who wish to find out more about this generational cohort’s behaviour. Further research may be of interest to see if this generation’s behaviour is considered by festival stakeholders to be more positive than those of previous generations, and why this is, if so.

5.5.2 Generation Z’s need for reassurance

Although not directly related to events, one of the interesting findings that emerged in the qualitative data collection phase was that Generation Z tourists from overseas were suggested to seek out reassurance about their decision-making while on trips, as per Participant 2:

“…what we have found is that curiously in some ways that generation is not very different particularly in the overseas side to the rest of the tourism market…ahh what we did find quite curiously is that for that age group they’re actually more inclined to say use a tourist office or ask questions of others, because they’ve relatively less life experience, they’re looking to lean on
others to get a st-, a steer. So they might go into a tourist office, for example, and look to find out what’s on in the area, what’s on in the next…place I’m visiting. They’re actually more likely to use our services.” – Participant 2

“…people, particularly of the younger cohort, they like to know they’ve made good decisions…and they like to have those decisions validated or corrected if they’re not right…and using people to do that is a great way of validating…that when you’re in a strange environment” – Participant 2

This is an interesting observation of Generation Z’s behaviour, however it is not directly linked with behaviour at festivals. In terms of existing literature relating to this, the finding is, in part, echoed by Dolot (2018). This study compared groups of Generation Z respondents. The findings from respondents born between the years of 1990 and 1995 suggested that this group identified to a greater extent with wanting to get an evaluative response from those who gave them jobs to do, than did the cohort of Generation Z who were born later (Dolot, 2018). It would seem that the findings in relation to the older group of Generation Z are in a way, related to Participant 2’s suggestion that Generation Z tourists look for reassurance. The receipt of feedback was shown to be of significance to this generational group in other research (e.g., InsideOut Development, n.d. cited in Communication Briefings, 2019, n.p.; Chicca and Shellenbarger, 2019). This also relates to O’Connor’s (2020, n.p.) suggestion that Generation Z “yearn for expert stewardship and life curators who can sift, distil and quiet the noise of the reams of knowledge at the fingertips”.

5.5.3 Generation Z’s motivations and behaviours in relation to money
Interestingly a finding that was not anticipated and which emerged in the qualitative findings, is that of Generation Z being more economical than the generation previous to them (Millennials). This is an important finding which is directly related to the research question which asks, ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?’’. This observation in relation to Generation Z festival-goers’ behaviour contributes to answering the research question. This is in line with previous findings. It is possible that this finding is a function of some of this generation experiencing their childhood in residences characterised by difficulties in relation to finances, as suggested by TDAmeritrade, (2012 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104). Amárach Research (n.d., p.2) also suggest that in relation to finances, this generational cohort are “more
conservative”. In a similar way, Vercelletto’s (2019) paper suggests that Generation Z have elevated levels of “price sensitivity” (Vercelletto, 2019, p.28). In terms of the existing literature relating to this, YSI and Amárach Research (2019a) carried out research on Generation Z in Ireland. When asked what they think would characterise a fruitful life for them in time to come, twenty per cent of the sample of Generation Z responded that being comfortable financially would be the most representative of a fruitful life (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a). Barnes and Noble College (n.d.) found that acquiring position that is deemed decent in terms of work, having completed college, is this sample’s greatest worry associated with third-level education (Barnes and Noble College, n.d.). These findings show that this generation place significance on not struggling financially.

This may be an interesting finding for festival organisers who deliberate about ticket prices and rates associated with festivals targeted at this generation. Whilst Generation Z might want to spend less than previous generations, they have high expectations and also have the ability to generate negative coverage of a festival using social media if they do not feel that their expectations are being met. So while festival organisers must keep the quality of provisions high, it’s possible that taking the focus away from the line-up slightly, but not altogether and allocating less budget to music acts and allocating more of the budget to other aspects of the festival, may be worth consideration. This could mean, for example, incorporating more areas where friends can socialise together and where attendees can acquire Social Capital and experience Flow. Such festival content may appeal to Generation Z attendees more than a highly priced festival that promotes itself based solely on its music acts.

Further research would be warranted to investigate the importance of pricing for Generation Z. In a more general context, further research on this generation in Ireland and their motivations and behaviours in relation to money would possibly be insightful for any organisations hoping to target them or in terms of the impact their outlooks will have on the future economy in Ireland, as this generation continue to enter the workforce (Randstad, 2016) and are becoming increasingly financially independent. This finding was not anticipated so Generation Z were not asked about this in the quantitative measure, the self-administered online survey, which was used to gather data from Generation Z.
In contrast to their suggested frugality, in terms of saving, Nielsen (2015) found that twenty-one per cent of Generation Z do not put a monetary amount aside for time to come on a monthly basis, and this was found for eighteen per cent of Millennials, twenty-seven per cent of Generation X and thirty-six per cent and thirty-four per cent of Boomers and the Silent Generation respectively. Thus, a greater percentage of Generation Z were found not to put a monetary amount aside for time to come than were their predecessors, the Millennials. This, however, may be a function of the life stage they are at, in that they have not established careers where they earn enough to save sufficient amounts, compared to their older counterparts, the Millennials. However, less of Generation Z were found to not put money aside for time to come than the generations preceding the Millennials, that is, Generation X, the Boomers and the Silent Generation (Nielsen, 2015), thus reinforcing the suggestion that they are a frugal generation. Further research would be of merit to investigate this finding further.

5.5.4 Expectations of Generation Z festival-goers
It is suggested that the expectations of Generation Z in relation to festivals are high because they have grown up with festivals, because they travel to festivals in Europe, but also because they are able to watch festivals such as Coachella on live stream and so, this increases their expectations. These behaviours, which have the impact of raising Generation Z festival-goers’ expectations, are all behaviours which were identified in the current study and this contributes to answering the element of the research question relating to behaviour in the current study. A wide range of elements that Generation Z are suggested to want at festivals were mentioned during the qualitative interview stage, and these mainly related to the overall production (such as better facilities (e.g., toilets), a wide range of offerings in terms of food, vendors such as those offering phone charging and hair blow drying, less queues, etc.) as opposed to being related to having better headline acts. The implications of this for festival stakeholders will be outlined in the concluding chapter.

5.5.5 Generation Z as smart/savvy
Again, the finding that Generation Z are savvy emerged in all three qualitative interviews, but in different contexts. For example, Generation Z were suggested
to be intelligent given the amount of data they have access to, by Participant 1. Participant 2 commented that this generation have an awareness that they are being marketed to. This is a point which festival stakeholders should take note of. Potentially here, marketing strategies need to be adapted so that festival marketers can use this to their advantage in some way. Finally, Participant 3 commented on the savviness of this generation, in terms of money, in terms of how clued in they are when they are in a festival context, as well as with cameras, and in terms of culture.

5.6 Objective 5: To identify the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of early Generation Z.

The factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z will be those constructs that showed significant relationships with Attendance and Event anticipation. It is expected that festival organisers would be interested in the elements that relate to Attendance and Event Anticipation.

5.6.1 Attendance

In relation to Attendance, the constructs relating to Attendance were outlined earlier in section 5.2.3.1 and 5.2.3.2. Flow was found to have a significant direct effect on Attendance and this was discussed. Flow was found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance and this was discussed. Flow was found to mediate the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance and this was discussed. Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between Event Attractions and Attendance and this was discussed. Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance and this was discussed. Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between External Socialisation and Attendance and this was discussed. Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance and this was discussed. The extent to which the findings above contributed to answering the research question of the current study have also been addressed in previous sections.

5.6.2 Event Anticipation

In relation to Event Anticipation, the constructs relating to Event Anticipation were outlined earlier in section 5.2.3.3 and 5.2.3.4. Event Attractions, External
Socialisation and Known Group Socialisation were each found to have a direct impact on Event Anticipation and these findings were discussed. Similarly, the moderation interaction finding relating to Event Anticipation was discussed. The extent to which the findings above contributed to answering the research question of the current study have also been addressed in previous sections.

5.6.3 Qualitative findings

5.6.3.1 More than just headliners

It was suggested that the music aspect of the festival Participant 1 is mainly associated with has almost become secondary to other elements associated with the festival:

“...campsites, toilets, access, price, all of those things have become more important...and the general atmosphere and the vibe and the actual line-up has become slightly less important…” – Participant 1

Festival organisers should pay attention to this finding, which is addressed further in the concluding chapter of this document.

Participant 1 suggests that for the market of Generation Z, a festival’s offering needs to be developed and basing the business model of the festival on just having headline acts would be quite difficult, if catering to Generation Z:

“...I think you have to to develop the offering you know I think if your...if your if your offering is solely based on your headliners...you know on your on your line up I think it is a pretty difficult business model amm so what you’ve got to do is to create something that’s either quite niche so like you know something that there’s just a smaller amount of people are into it but you know...you directly attract them or in the case of something like (extract removed for confidentiality reasons), amm it’s creating that that safe space that easy access that you know amm campsites, toilets, showers, you know that’s and that and that ticket price…” – Participant 1

This finding is of interest as although music festivals were the most popular festival-type specified in the current study, it would appear that it’s possibly not the headline acts that feature at music festivals that are the main attraction for Generation Z. It would be interesting to investigate this further and glean what aspect of the music festivals that appeal to Generation Z, i.e., what are the Event Attractions specifically at music festivals that motivate Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland to attend music festivals. It may be that many of the festivals
specified by the sample in the current study have already developed their offering and are already offering more in terms of infrastructure and production, in addition to their music production and headline act offering.

5.6.3.2 Facilities

a). Environmentally-friendly elements

Water-refilling points were suggested to be popular among Generation Z festival-goers in the qualitative data collection stage. This finding could either relate to the fact that Generation Z are more conscious of what they spend their money on, and would rather re-fill their water bottle than needlessly purchase a new bottle of water. Alternatively, the finding could relate to Generation Z being more environmentally aware than previous generations. In a similar way, it was mentioned that a festival had to include a vegan food vendor, as vegetarian wasn’t sufficient. Individuals may wish to eat vegan food for a number of reasons, one of which may be that they are trying to eat in a more environmentally-friendly manner. Thus, these two elements – water refill points and vegan food offerings – may be related to the fact that Generation Z may be more conscious of being environmentally-friendly, but this is just one possibility and certainly not definitive. Thus, while these findings are interesting, the reason for the appeal of environmentally-friendly elements at festivals remains to be seen. Thus, these findings are of limited value in contributing to answering the research question of the current study.

In terms of literature relating to Generation Z and the environment, YSI and Amárach Research (2019a) found that among Generation Z, climate change was selected as the fifth largest problem for the youth residing in Ireland. Among males and females, climate change was the problem towards which this sample reported visualising themselves getting involved in, in a bid to improve the problem (YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a). In relation to climate change, it was found by Parker, Graf and Igielnik (2019) that approximately five out of ten members of Generation Z (fifty-four per cent) said that climate change is a result of the actions of people (Parker, Graf and Igielnik, 2019). In this case, as fifty-four per cent see climate change as something that people have made a contribution to, they may also see it as something we can contribute to slowing down or stopping, and hence appreciate the water refill points or a vegan food
offering, as they see it as an effort towards climate change reduction. Porter, Novelli/Cone’s (2019) findings suggest affairs related to the environment and society bother eighty-eight per cent of Generation Z. Porter Novelli/Cone’s (2019) found that the “Environment” (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019, p.7) heads the list of concerns that Generation Z respondents wish for corporations to face (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Thus, Generation Z could be suggested to be environmentally aware and appreciative of elements of festival content that enable them to play a part in not contributing to climate change. In the same way, if this finding is related to needless purchasing, then Generation Z may be appreciative of a water-refilling station or a vegan food offering for this reason. Either way, this finding should be of interest for festival organisers who wish to pay heed to the wants of Generation Z.

Porter, Novelli/Cone (2019) also found that seventy-seven per cent of Generation Z tend to engage in looking for information about whether a corporation is having a positive or negative impact socially or environmentally. Social media was found to facilitate the acquisition of knowledge about, and involvement in, matters that are of importance to, or that bother this sample, by ninety-one per cent of the sample (Porter, Novelli/Cone, 2019). Festival organisers should pay heed to this, and should consider suitable messaging of any positive social or environmental impressions they are making which are deemed important by Generation Z.

b). Wi-Fi and phone charging

The finding that the capturing and sharing of experiences at festivals has become more prevalent at festivals now than it was 4 or 5 years ago emerged in the qualitative data collection stage. This finding contributes to answering the research question of the current study as it identifies a behaviour of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Research by YSI and Amárach Research (2019b) relating to Generation Z in Ireland, found that four hours was the mean quantity of time which these respondents used their smartphones for each day. This shows the use of smart phones among Generation Z in Ireland alone is quite high. Stark differences were found in terms of the percentages of teenagers who were found to be on the Internet not quite, but close to, incessantly in 2014/2015 (twenty-
four per cent) (Pew Research Center, 2015) and 2018 (forty-five per cent) (Anderson and Jiang, 2018).

Festival organisers should take note of the importance of this when budgeting and deciding on which important infrastructure elements and which vendors to include within their festival site, with the inclusion of Wi-Fi and phone charging units suggested to be of significant importance. Festival stakeholders must also remember that this may be of significant benefit to them, as posts curated by festival-goers are user-generated content which acts as a free type of marketing for a given festival that is posted about. Such content cannot be created without charged phones with sufficient battery.

Overall, the production elements of a festival, including the infrastructure, vendors and general offerings seem to be of great importance to this generation who have “grown up” (Participant 3) with festivals and the implications of this for festival stakeholders will be discussed in the concluding chapter.

5.7 Conclusion
This chapter identifies the main findings outlined in the Findings chapter and discusses them more thoroughly. A number of the findings are discussed in light of the extent to which they contribute to answering the research question of the current study. The current study’s findings have resulted in the identification a range of motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland and it is intended that these findings will bridge the gap that appears to exist in the literature in relation to the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Some possible explanations for the findings outlined as well as some recommendations for festival organisers to pay heed to where relevant. The main findings are discussed in light of existing literature and innovative findings are discussed, while the importance of where further research would be of merit is highlighted in some areas. The concluding chapter will outline the main contributions of the current study to the literature relating to the topics at hand, the key findings for festival stakeholders and finally the avenues recommended for further research.
Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

The research at hand is the first of its kind in Ireland and is an innovative exploration of the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. The overall goal of the current study was to answer the following research question: ‘What are the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z in Ireland?’. It was intended that this research would bridge a gap that appears to exist within the field of festival motivation research, in terms of identifying the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. Generation Z are a fascinating demographic and they are coming of age by the day. However, this generational cohort appears to be under-researched in Ireland and in relation to festivals and events, Generation Z in Ireland appear to be largely under-researched. The current study investigated this cohort’s motivations and behaviours using quantitative data collected from a sample of eighteen to twenty-three year olds who have attended a festival, and using qualitative data collected from leaders in the festival sector and tourism industry. The research objectives are outlined in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Research objectives

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To determine the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how Generation Z festival-goers interact with festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers' level of attendance and participation at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers' behaviour at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To identify the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before the research took place, a gap had been identified in the research which related to Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, and their motives and behaviours. Generation Z includes those individuals who were born between the years of 1995 and 2009 (e.g., Goh and Lee, 2018). This generational group is
gradually gaining employment or working (Randstad, 2016). Therefore, this group could be said to represent current and/or future spenders. Thus, this study aimed to investigate these consumers, who are gradually attaining spending power of their own, and their motives as well as their behaviours in relation to festivals. As previously discussed, festivals bestow effects upon the area in which they are held, in “economic, socio-cultural, and political” form (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006, p.2). Festivals are of great significance to the tourism industry in Ireland. Fáilte Ireland (2019) have suggested that festivals and events in Ireland are the reason that two hundred thousand tourists from abroad come to Ireland annually and they make an economic impact of well over one hundred million euro to the country. Therefore, the current study which investigates this emerging generation of adults and their motivations and behaviours in relation to festivals, is considered of significance at this time. A number of findings emerged in the current study which answered the research questions, which are as follows (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2 Research questions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What are the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>To what extent does technology shape how Generation Z festival-goers interact with festivals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What are the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers’ level of attendance and participation at festivals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What are the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers’ behaviour at festivals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What is the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the wants of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of the current study have been summarised in the Findings chapter (chapter 4) and the key findings have been discussed at length in the Discussion and Analysis chapter (chapter 5).
6.2 Key contributions to the existing literature

The current study has made a significant contribution to the existing literature in terms of giving an overview of the motives and behaviours of Gen Z festival goers in Ireland. This research area does not appear to have previously been investigated in Ireland. This study intended to bridge what appears to be a gap in the festival motivation literature in terms of the identification of the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. There are a number of key contributions to the existing literature which will be discussed in the sections below.

6.2.1 Generation Z

The current study adds to the current literature on Generation Z in Ireland, as to date, there appears to be a limited amount of research that has focused on Generation Z in Ireland. Research that has been conducted on Generation Z in Ireland includes that carried out by YSI and Amárach Research (e.g., YSI and Amárach Research, 2019a, 2019b and 2019c). The current study highlights that music festivals appear to be the most popular type of festival among the sample who participated. This is worth further investigation. Those operating within the arts and community festival sector may be interested in investigating this finding further, as might those supporting same, in terms of funding. Within the qualitative analysis, it emerged that this generation are suggested to be well behaved, as well as frugal with their money. They also have high expectations regarding their festival experiences. Generation Z from overseas were found to seek out reassurance when making decisions with regards to their trips. Similarly, they are suggested to be a savvy generational cohort, in a number of ways. Although overall, there is a significant amount of research that has been carried out on this generation globally, the current research’s findings will add to the global body of research but also will contribute to the more limited amount of research that has been carried out in the Irish context.

6.2.2 Social Capital

Quantitative findings revealed that Social Capital had a small but direct impact upon Event Anticipation. Among the sample of Generation Z who participated in this study, females were also found to have higher scores on this construct than
were males. The inclination to attain Social Capital by way of capturing and sharing their festival experiences on social media is prevalent among this cohort. Participant 1 – Music Festival Organiser, suggested that 4-5 years ago, the use of burner phones was common whereas nowadays, festival-goers use smart phones that allow them to capture and share their experiences on Instagram and Snapchat. Yeoman (2013) has suggested that as “social networking reaches saturation point and smart phones dominate social communication, opportunities to parade one’s social and cultural capital will only become more frequent” (p. 256). Yeoman (2013) also forecasted that individuals will develop “portfolios” of what they get to see and what they are present for at festivals and events, which is similar to what has been observed by leaders in the festival sector and tourism industry who took part in this study with regards to Generation Z. This generation do go to festivals and do capture and share their experiences, or accumulate social capital. Although this is not seen to be the sole reason for which they attend, it does make up a significant part of their experience overall.

6.2.3 Flow
In a similar way, there is much research which focuses on the concept of ‘Flow’, and the current study will contribute to the literature as it focuses on the experiences of ‘Flow’ among eighteen to twenty-three year olds in a festival setting. The current study also adds to the literature on festival experiences here as it points to the importance of Flow as a possible motive for Attendance among this age-group.

6.2.4 Festival Motivation Studies
As mentioned previously, the current study contributes to the existing literature surrounding festival motivation. Not only does it identify motives that have been found in previous studies to explain the variance in attendees’ motivation (e.g., Event Attractions, as found by Lee, 2000), but it also identified novel motives (e.g., Flow) that highlight the need for further investigation to verify if these novel motives have a part to play in explaining variance in motivation to attend, among other samples of festival-goers.
6.3 Key findings for festival stakeholders

There were a number of findings within this research that may be of interest to festival stakeholders in general, for example, those who organise festivals and those who fund festivals. The following paragraphs will outline some of the key findings that may be of use to festival stakeholders whose festival target market includes Generation Z festival-goers.

6.3.1 Need for reassurance

The finding that Generation Z tourists have a need for reassurance in relation to decisions they make on their trip was highlighted by Participant 2 – Tourism Organisation. Although this finding is not directly related to festivals, it related to strange environments, and this could be of interest to festival stakeholders as it may highlight the importance of including Information Points and adequate numbers of stewards who are easy to access and easily spotted around a festival site. This finding emerged despite the fact that Generation Z have information to hand on their smartphones. It would seem that although festival organisers may feel that they have this aspect of the event covered, in that their festivals’ websites may have all of the information that an attendee could require, it would appear that it may be important to Generation Z to have people on site that can help a Generation Z attendee get his or her bearings and to provide information. An add-on to this point would be to ensure that such information providers and stewards are well-informed and do not simply re-direct Gen Z attendees to the festival website.

6.3.2 Music has become secondary

A second key finding in this study is that including headliner acts in the content of music festival may now be less important than it once was. This is important for those involved in the music festival sector as it may be that other elements of the festival have gained more importance, such as including content with which Generation Z can take pictures with or beside (in the acquisition of Social Capital), areas that facilitate socialisation of friend groups (Known Group Socialisation) and areas that facilitate the experience of Flow. Overall, it could be that the festival could cost less if the number of headliner acts were reduced and budget was instead spent on elements that cost less, but still contribute
hugely to the festival experience for Generation Z. This point may also be worth taking note of when marketing the festival. ‘Flow’, for example, accounted (along with ‘Event Anticipation’ and ‘Event Attractions’) for 45% of the variance explained in ‘Attendance’ among the current study’s sample of Generation Z festival-goers. Thus, content related to the opportunity to experience Flow should be showcased within the festival marketing, as this may be an important element of the festival content for Generation Z festival-goers to be aware of before they make a decision to attend a festival.

6.3.3 High expectations among Generation Z regarding their festival experience

It is proposed that Generation Z see festivals like Coachella, on live stream, and don’t expect that level of production but do have a certain level of expectation regarding the production of the festival. This finding means that the production elements of a festival need to be of a high standard and adequate budget needs to be allocated to providing this for these attendees. Elements such as Wi-Fi, toilets, access and queue times, tents and facilities overall need to be of a reasonably good standard. This should also be showcased within the festival marketing.

6.3.4 User-generated marketing

As suggested previously, it has been found that Generation Z engage in the capturing and sharing of their experiences on social media quite prevalently. For the purposes of this study, this activity has been termed as the acquisition of Social Capital. Festival stakeholders should note that as this is prevalent, the festival content itself should be aesthetically-appealing, as they cannot control where images of the festival will be shared and in a case where the festival does not look good, this could result in other prospective attendees deciding not to attend this festival in the future. In contrast, if the festival in general is shared and the images look good, this can act as a form of free marketing of the festival to prospective Generation Z festival-goers, who may make the decision to attend this festival in the future. The finding that Social Capital acquisition is prevalent among this generation of attendees means that images and videos etc. will be shared, and it highlights that from a festival organisation’s point of view,
emphasis should be placed on ensuring these images reflect the festival in a positive rather than a negative light. Once the festival marketing manager is happy that the content of their festival reflects the festival in a positive light, then attendees should be persuaded to capture and share their experiences, in a similar way to how Fáilte Ireland (2017) suggested tourists to a holiday location should be persuaded to capture and share imagery (on their social networks) of what they have seen or been present for. High quality Wi-Fi should be accessible and shouldn’t cost the user any money as well as what Fáilte Ireland (2017) describe as “lots of photo opportunity prompts which encourage social media conversation” (p.14).

6.3.5 Generation Z and money
The finding that Generation Z appear to be more frugal than previous generations, may be something to take note of for festival stakeholders. Two qualitative interview participants operating in the festival industry commented on Generation Z’s inclination to be economical. It was also noted that this generation know what they want from their festival experience. This is an important finding in that festival organisers should take note that finding out what Generation Z wants from their specific festival is a worthwhile endeavour. It’s clear that they are more conscious of how they spend their money and thus, pricing of festival tickets as well as of other elements on site (such as food) need to be considered thoroughly.

6.3.6 Opportunities to socialise with friends
In the current study, Event Anticipation was found to mediate the positive relationship between Known Group Socialisation and Attendance. This highlights the importance of creating plenty of social spaces within the festival site wherein friends can gather, socialise and create memories together. This presents even more opportunities for festivals. In a similar way, it should be noted that any areas wherein friends cannot stay together should be avoided. For example, having larger tents available in which groups of friends can be accommodated together would be a way of doing this, if there were no safety issues attached. In a similar way, festivals could use this to their advantage as less space is taken up by having one large tent as opposed to several smaller
ones. Festivals could also offer small group discounts to large friend groups who purchase their tickets in one transaction, to encourage ticket sales. This discount could be offset by the festival as it may require less administrative resources to process the tickets of one group sale than it would to process each person’s ticket sale individually.

6.3.7 Wi-Fi and charging stations
The importance of these two elements at a festival are explained by the fact that Generation Z tend to capture and share their festival experiences on social media. This needs to be noted by festival organisers at the time when they are deciding on which suppliers will pitch within their festival site during the festival period.

6.3.8 Targeted campaigns for those high in Inhibition
Inhibition strengthens the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation. It is suggested that festival marketers should note this and implement marketing campaigns that present those Generation Z festival-goers for whom this is applicable, the advantages that this moderation interaction effect bestows.

6.4 Recommendations for future research
This research, which explored the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers, measured both previously investigated constructs and novel constructs when looking at the motivations of Generation Z festival-goers to attend festivals. In a similar way, the qualitative data analysis led to several unanticipated insights about Generation Z. Therefore, the current study has identified several areas which would merit further exploration and investigation. These avenues for further research will be outlined in the following paragraphs.

6.4.1 Flow
The opportunity to experience Flow emerged as a motive of Generation Z festival-goers in relation to their attendance at festivals in this research. This appears not to have been identified as a motive within the festival motivation literature to date. Further research would be of merit to delineate whether this is a
motive that is generalisable to the wider population of Generation Z festival-goers or even festival-goers in general, regardless of age.

6.4.2 Event Anticipation
Event Anticipation was another construct of importance in this study and was used as a dependent variable. Further study on this construct would be of value in that it was found to explain 45% of the variance in Attendance along with two other constructs and appears not to have explored to date within the festival motivation literature.

6.4.3 Popularity of Music Festivals among Gen Z
Further research may be warranted to investigate why it is that music festivals emerged as the most popular type of festival among this sample of Generation Z. Taking the current study, this finding still may be of interest to community festival organisers as well as those funding same, and it could warrant further investigation.

6.4.4 Festival motivation
Firstly, a limited number of constructs were measured in relation to the motives of Generation Z in this study. It would useful to carry out further research looking at what other constructs may predict the dependent variables (Attendance and Event Anticipation), given that 45% and 50% of the variance was explained for each construct respectively in the current research. There is scope for a greater amount of the variance in these dependent variables to be explained and this may be done by exploring more constructs and testing their relationships with Attendance and Event Anticipation.

6.4.5 The mediation effect of Event Anticipation
Further research would be warranted to investigate why Event Anticipation mediates the positive relationship between both External Socialisation and Attendance as well as Known Group Socialisation and Attendance.
6.4.6 Social Capital and Event Anticipation
Social Capital was found to have a direct effect on Event Anticipation. Although the size of this effect is small, further research is required to investigate if this is explained by the proposal that Generation Z may look forward to the prospect of gaining Social Capital at festivals. Again, as Event Anticipation was among three predictors of Attendance, further research may be warranted in looking at what constructs predict Event Anticipation also, given its close relation to Attendance.

6.4.7 The evolution of presence
Given that this generation have grown up in a world where the Internet has always existed (Prensky, 2001 cited in Turner, 2015, p.104), it should be investigated further whether this cohort have evolved so that they can remain present and in the moment (and to what extent), while also engaging with technology. It was suggested by one participant in the current study that our sense of being present may be evolving, and it was suggested by another participant that although Generation Z are less engaged because of their interaction with their phones, they are still highly engaged despite this. Contemporary investigation into what constitutes presence in today’s modern world may be worth exploring.

6.4.8 Generation Z as consumers
Further research would finally be warranted to investigate the importance of pricing for Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland and also to investigate whether their motivations and behaviours in relation to money will differ from previous generations in Ireland. It would also be of interest to investigate what effect this may have on the future economy of Ireland.

6.5 Conclusion
This chapter outlines what the current study set out to achieve. While the findings were identified in chapter 4, the Findings chapter, and these were subsequently discussed in chapter 5, the Discussion and Analysis chapter, the current chapter outlines the key contributions of the current study to the existing literature, the key findings for festival stakeholders and finally the key areas for further research. The current study is innovative, and is the first of its kind in
Ireland. It aimed to explore the motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, so that festival stakeholders will be facilitated in catering to the wants of this generational cohort. This generation appears to be under-researched in Ireland, and is largely under-researched in the context of festivals and events in Ireland. Generation Z is graduating into adulthood and their motivations and behaviours in relation to festivals are of huge importance to the festival industry, given that they are an extremely important market for the industry. The findings of the current study show Generation Z to be a fascinating cohort and knowledge of their idiosyncrasies will undoubtedly be of worth to those operating in the festival industry, as well as to festival stakeholders.
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Appendix C - Online survey including Information Sheet, Consent Form, Demographic Questionnaire, survey items and Debriefing Form for quantitative data collection

An exploration of the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z attendees in relation to festivals in Ireland.

INFORMATION SHEET

Purpose of the research

This primary goal of this research is to explore the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z attendees in relation to festivals in Ireland.

Who is undertaking the research and why?

Sinead O'Mahony is the researcher and she is conducting this study as part of her MA. Sinead is a postgraduate Event Management researcher at the Institute of Technology Tralee.

It is proposed that there are currently four living generations. The different living generations are suggested to be categorised as follows: Traditionalists, born approximately between 1922 and 1945; Baby Boomers, born approximately between 1946 and 1964; Generation X, born approximately between 1965 and 1977; Millennials, born approximately between 1977 and 1993 and Generation Z, born approximately between 1993 and 2005. Generation Z is proposed by other authors in the field to include those individuals born between the years of 1995 and 2009. At the time of last census, Generation Z represented approximately 20% of the Irish population (CSO, 2016).

This research is focusing specifically on early Generation Z, those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of this research. There is very little research on this group and this study will investigate their attitudes, motivation and behaviour regarding festivals in Ireland.

Participation in this research will provide pioneering insight into this topic. It is hoped that the findings of this research will be presented to tourism bodies and those operating in the festival industry in Ireland, in order to enhance festivals for this cohort in Ireland.

What is expected of participants?

Before participating in this study, it is important that you know a little more about the study and what is involved in participating.

- By completing the Consent Form, you are giving your consent to participate in the study.
- You will then be asked to respond to a series of questions and statements following the Demographic Form.
- Finally, you will be given a Debriefing Form to read through.

Participants’ rights

Freedom of Information

In line with the Freedom of Information Act (2003), all data collected as part of this study will be stored in a secure location for not less than two years, after which time it will be destroyed.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

Your contribution to the study will be completely anonymous and will be kept in strict confidence. Identifiable information such as your name is not required to complete the online survey. Please use an incognito window and ensure that you are logged off from your Google accounts, including Gmail when completing the survey.

GDPR

All researchers at the Institute of Technology Tralee are obliged to be GDPR compliant and have completed training in research ethics.
Consent Form

Please read the following statements and respond as appropriate.

1. I have read the Information Sheet and I am clear about what this study relates to. *
   Mark only one oval
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

2. I confirm that I am aged 18 years old or older. *
   Mark only one oval
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

3. I agree to participate in this study, the results of which may be published. *
   Mark only one oval
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Demographic Form

Some general information is being collected as part of this study to help in the analysis of the data that is being recorded.

4. My age is ... *
   Mark only one oval
   ○ 18
   ○ 19
   ○ 20
   ○ 21
   ○ 22
   ○ 23
   ○ Other:

5. My gender is ... *
   Mark only one oval
   ○ Female
   ○ Male
   ○ Prefer not to say
   ○ Other:

6. My nationality is ... *

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1JT7UL4kuVnqkZaTeFm8Wqj3klyjVcS-ujj3ummoWMM/edit
7. Please tick the highest level of educational attainment you have achieved... *
Mark only one oval.
- Level 10 Doctoral Degree/Higher Doctorate
- Level 9 Masters Degree/Postgrad Diploma
- Level 8 Honours Bachelor Degree
- Level 7 Ordinary Bachelor Degree
- Level 6 Advanced or Higher Certificate
- Level 4/5 Leaving Certificate/A Levels/Equivalent
- Level 3 Junior Certificate/GCSE/O Levels/Equivalent
- Other:

8. If other, please specify:

9. I am currently ... (tick as many as are relevant to you) *
Tick all that apply.
- working on a full-time basis.
- working on a part-time basis.
- unemployed.
- in full-time education.
- Other:

Festivals in Ireland
Please think about the last festival you went to, or the festival from which you have the most vivid memories. Please respond to the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

A festival you may have attended could include:

- a local festival in your town e.g., The Rose of Tralee Festival, Dingle Food Festival, K-Fest in Killorglin, Killarney Mountain Festival;
- a Music festival e.g., Longitude, Electric Picnic, Cork Jazz Festival, Fleadh Cheoil na hÉireann;
- an Arts festival e.g., Carlow Arts Festival, Galway Arts Festival, Listowel Writers Week;
- a Film festival e.g., Kerry Film Festival, Dingle Film Festival, The Richard Harris Film Festival in Limerick;
- a Food festival e.g., Tralee Food Festival, Dingle Food Festival

or

- a festival with a specific theme such as Ireland Bike Fest in Killarney, Beer Fest, a Comedy Festival or a Festival celebrating a saint (e.g., St Patrick’s Day Festival in Dublin).

If there is another festival outside of these categories that you have attended, please feel free to reference that festival while responding to the following statements.

10. Please specify the festival you will have in mind when answering the following questions below. Name of festival:*
Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

11. While at festivals, I like to experience customs and cultures different from those in my own environment. *
   Mark only one oval
   [ ] Strongly Agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Neutral
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly Disagree

12. While at festivals, I seek out cultural events that I do not normally have the opportunity to go to. *
   Mark only one oval
   [ ] Strongly Agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Neutral
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly Disagree

13. My ideal festival involves looking at things I have not seen before. *
   Mark only one oval
   [ ] Strongly Agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Neutral
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly Disagree

14. I want there to be a sense of discovery involved as part of my festival experience. *
   Mark only one oval
   [ ] Strongly Agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Neutral
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly Disagree

15. I want to see new things while at festivals. *
   Mark only one oval
   [ ] Strongly Agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Neutral
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly Disagree

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1SIT7ULU4eNsMzZnuFmgAwJgjkWYTc8-njj3uunmW/edit
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16. I like to find myself in situations where I can explore new things. *
Mark only one oval

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

17. While at festivals, I like to increase my knowledge of local culture. *
Mark only one oval

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

18. *
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hang out with new people at festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I chat with new people at festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learn from new people at festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I meet new people who enjoy the same things as I do at festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I meet new people with similar interests to me at festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are still reading this, please click ‘neutral’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.
19. *  
Mark only one oval per row.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festivals allow me to be with my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to go to festivals with a friend group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to spend quality time with my friend group at festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals allow me to spend quality time with my friend group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals allow our friend group to hang out together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals allow our friend group to get really close.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

20. Being able to share my festival experience on social media is important to me. *  
Mark only one oval.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. I enjoy showing others my festival experiences on social media. *  
Mark only one oval.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. Festival experiences give me more to talk about to my friends. *  
Mark only one oval.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
23. **Social media is a great platform for sharing my festival experiences with my friends.**  
Mark only one oval  
- Strongly Agree  
- Agree  
- Neutral  
- Disagree  
- Strongly Disagree  

24. **If you are still reading this, please click 'Strongly Agree'.**  
Mark only one oval  
- Strongly Agree  
- Agree  
- Neutral  
- Disagree  
- Strongly Disagree  

25. **I like to get at least one great image of my festival experience to share on social media.**  
Mark only one oval  
- Strongly Agree  
- Agree  
- Neutral  
- Disagree  
- Strongly Disagree  

26. **Capturing my festival experience for others to see is important to me.**  
Mark only one oval  
- Strongly Agree  
- Agree  
- Neutral  
- Disagree  
- Strongly Disagree  

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

27. **People in my friend group who go to festivals have more prestige than those who do not.**  
Mark only one oval  
- Strongly Agree  
- Agree  
- Neutral  
- Disagree  
- Strongly Disagree  

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/15T7U4o4rN4pZvnFmgAWp7Jk5b/WYTcS-nij3uNMoX/fm/edit
28. **People in my friend group who go to festivals have a high profile.**
   * Mark only one oval
     - Strongly Agree
     - Agree
     - Neutral
     - Disagree
     - Strongly Disagree

29. **Going to a festival is a status symbol in my friend group.**
   * Mark only one oval
     - Strongly Agree
     - Agree
     - Neutral
     - Disagree
     - Strongly Disagree

30. **People in my friend group who go to festivals are more popular than those who do not go.**
    * Mark only one oval
     - Strongly Agree
     - Agree
     - Neutral
     - Disagree
     - Strongly Disagree

31. **People in my friend group who go to festivals are cooler than those who don’t go.**
    * Mark only one oval
     - Strongly Agree
     - Agree
     - Neutral
     - Disagree
     - Strongly Disagree

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.
32. * Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My attention was focused entirely/exclusively on what I was doing at the festival.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not concerned with what others may have been thinking of me at the festival.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time seemed to alter (either slowed down or speeded up) at the festival.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt in total control of what I was doing at the festival.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way time passed at the festival seemed to be different from normal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did things more spontaneously at the festival than usual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

33. * Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am very much up for attending festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to festivals makes me happy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not put off attending festivals because of cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not put off attending festivals because of travel distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not put off attending festivals because of festival line-up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to festivals mainly because I want to go myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not put off attending festivals because of my disposable income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1SJ7iE4uJNqNPzZwCmFmAMqfjFYWYycSujj3umxWMM/edit
34. I am shy when I have to talk to an unfamiliar person. *
Mark only one oval

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

35. If you are still reading this, please click 'Strongly Disagree'. *
Mark only one oval

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

36. I talk easily to an unfamiliar person. *
Mark only one oval

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

37. I feel nervous when I have to talk to an unfamiliar person. *
Mark only one oval

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

38. I feel good and I am able to laugh when I talk to an unfamiliar person. *
Mark only one oval

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1SIT7UL46bNtgFLz6F/WhV7V5V-S-a3j3urno/WhM/edit
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always try to practice what I preach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never resent being asked to return a favour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never been annoyed when people expressed ideas very different from my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to gossip at times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.

40. I look forward to attending festivals in the future. *

Mark only one oval

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

41. I feel excited when I think about upcoming festivals. *

Mark only one oval

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
42. If you are still reading this, please click ‘Agree’. *
Mark only one oval
☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

43. I enjoy the lead up to festivals. *
Mark only one oval
☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

44. I like thinking about future festivals whilst I’m at a festival. *
Mark only one oval
☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

45. The lead up to a festival is an exciting time. *
Mark only one oval
☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

Please answer the statements to follow with the specific festival you attended in mind.
An exploration of the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z attendees in relation to festivals in Ireland.

46. *  

Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I go to festivals to enjoy special events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to festivals to see new and different things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to festivals to enjoy the festival mood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to festivals to enjoy a unique atmosphere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend festivals that sound like fun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Debriefing Form**

Thank you for your participation in my research!

This primary goal of this research is to explore early Generation Z (those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of this research) and their attitudes, motivation and behaviour regarding festivals in Ireland. Your participation in this research will help to provide pioneering insight into this topic. It is hoped that the findings of this research will be presented to tourism bodies and those operating in the festival industry in Ireland, in order to enhance festivals for this cohort in Ireland.

Participants' rights

Freedom of Information
In line with the Freedom of Information Act (2003), all data collected as part of this study will be stored in a secure location for not less than two years, after which time it will be destroyed.

Confidentiality and Anonymity
Your contribution to the study will be completely anonymous and will be kept in strict confidence. Identifiable information such as your name is not required to complete the online survey.

GDPR
All researchers at Institute of Technology Tralee are obliged to be GDPR compliant and have completed training in research ethics.

Please see below the details of the researcher of this study. Please feel free to get in touch at any time should you have any further queries.

Name: Sinead O'Mahony  
Email: [Redacted]

Powered by Google Forms

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1JSIT7ULU4sNdfq3ZueFmFgA0wqjskWYTvS-uji3ummoWM/edit 13/13
Appendix D - Information Sheet for semi-structured interviews/qualitative data collection

Name of researcher: Sinead O’Mahony
Faculty/School/Department: Irish Academy of Hospitality and Tourism (IAHT), and School of Business, Computing and Humanities in Institute of Technology, Tralee.
Research Title: ‘An exploration of the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland’ (working title)
Purpose of the research: This primary goal of this research is to explore the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland

Who is undertaking the research and why?
Sinead O’Mahony is the researcher and she is conducting this study as part of her MA. Sinead is a postgraduate Masters by Research student at the Institute of Technology Tralee.

Current generations include Traditionalists, born approximately between 1922 and 1945; Baby Boomers, born approximately between 1946 and 1964; Generation X, born approximately between 1965 and 1977; Millennials, born approximately between 1977 and 1993 and Generation Z, born approximately between 1993 and 2005. Generation Z is proposed by other authors in the field to include those individuals born between the years of 1995 and 2009. At the time of last census, Generation Z represented approximately 20% of the Irish population (CSO, 2016).

This research is focusing specifically on early Generation Z, those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of this research. There is very little research on this group and this study will investigate the attitudes, motivation and behaviour of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

Participation in this research will provide pioneering insight into this topic. It is hoped that the findings of this research will be presented to tourism bodies and those operating in the festival industry in Ireland, in order to enhance festivals for this cohort in Ireland.

What is expected of participants?
Before participating in this study, it is important that you know more about the study and what is involved in participating.

After reading this Information Sheet, if you are happy to participate, please fill in the Consent Form (attached). Please return the Consent Form to the researcher
(Sinead O’Mahony) in person or by scanning it and emailing it to

By signing the Consent Form, you are giving your consent to participate in semi-structured interviews wherein a discussion will take place regarding the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland, those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of this research. Please note that the researcher will record the discussion that occurs during the interview. Therefore by consenting to participate, your contribution will be recorded. Your contributions will be anonymised with a participant number and will be kept completely confidential. However, you will be identified as being associated with either a community festival, a music festival, or a tourism organisation in the research (e.g., Participant X, Music Festival Organiser). The festival(s) you are associated with will not be named.

**Participants’ rights**

*Freedom of Information*

In line with the Freedom of Information Act 2003, all data collected as part of this study will be stored in a secure location for not less than two years, after which time it will be destroyed.

*Confidentiality and Anonymity*

Your contribution to the study will be completely anonymous and will be kept in strict confidence. Your contribution to the discussion during this interview will be anonymised with a participant number. A participant number will be assigned to all data collected and participants’ names will not be associated with quotations used in the study. Any personal details or testimony will not be released at any time. The final report will not reveal any participants’ names, in order to assure participants’ anonymity. However, you will be identified as being associated with either a community festival, a music festival, or a tourism organisation in the research (e.g., Participant X, Music Festival Organiser). The festival(s) you are associated with will not be named.

*GDPR*

All researchers at the Institute of Technology Tralee are obliged to be GDPR compliant and have completed training in research ethics.
Appendix E - Consent Form for semi-structured interviews/qualitative data collection

Name of researcher: Sinead O’Mahony
Faculty/School/Department: Irish Academy of Hospitality and Tourism (IAHT), and School of Business, Computing and Humanities in Institute of Technology, Tralee.
Title of Study: ‘An exploration of the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland’ (working title)

Please read the following statements and tick yes or no as appropriate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please read the following statements and tick yes or no as appropriate:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have read the information sheet and I am clear about what this study relates to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I confirm that I am aged 18 years old or older.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I agree to participate in this study, the results of which may be published.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I agree to be audio recorded for this interview.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I give consent to my responses to be published as anonymised quotes in this dissertation or in any other academic paper(s) that may arise from the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I give my consent to being identified as being associated with either a community festival, a music festival, or a tourism organisation in the research (e.g., Participant X, Music Festival Organiser).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed:
Name in Block Letters:
Date:
Appendix F - Debriefing Form for semi-structured interviews/qualitative data collection

Thank you for your participation in my research!

This primary goal of this research is to explore the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers (those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of this research) in Ireland. Your participation in this research will help to provide insight into this topic. It is hoped that the findings of this research will be presented to tourism bodies and those operating in the festival industry in Ireland, in order to enhance festivals for this cohort in Ireland.

Participants’ rights

Freedom of Information

In line with the Freedom of Information Act 2003, all data collected as part of this study will be stored in a secure location for not less than two years, after which time it will be destroyed.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

Your contribution to the study will be completely anonymous and will be kept in strict confidence. Your contribution to the discussion during this interview will be anonymised with a participant number. A participant number will be assigned to all data collected and participants’ names will not be associated with quotations used in the study. Any personal details or testimony will not be released at any time. The final report will not reveal any participants’ names, in order to assure participants’ anonymity. However, you will be identified as being associated with either a community festival, a music festival, or a tourism organisation in the research (e.g., Participant X, Music Festival Organiser). The festival(s) you are associated with will not be named.

GDPR

All researchers at the Institute of Technology Tralee are obliged to be GDPR compliant and have completed training in research ethics.

Please see below the details of the researcher of this study. Please feel free to get in touch at any time should you have any further queries.

Name: Sinead O’Mahony

Email: [Redacted]
Appendix G - Recruitment email for semi-structured interviews/qualitative data collection

(Please note this email was different in each case.)

Recruitment email for semi-structured interviews/qualitative data collection

Dear Participant,

My name is Sinead O’Mahony and I am a post-graduate Masters by Research student with the Irish Academy of Hospitality and Tourism (IAHT), and School of Business, Computing and Humanities in Institute of Technology, Tralee.

My research is entitled ‘An exploration of the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland’ (working title).

Generation Z is suggested to include those individuals born between the years of 1995 and 2009. At the time of last census, Generation Z represented approximately 20% of the Irish population (CSO, 2016). The primary goal of this research is to explore the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. I am conducting this study as part of my MA.

There is very limited existing research exploring the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers (those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of this research) in Ireland. It is hoped that my research will provide valuable insight into this topic. It is hoped that the research will be of significant value to those involved in producing and organising festivals in Ireland, and planning tourism policy in this area. It is envisaged that the findings of this research will be presented to tourism bodies and those operating within the festival industry in Ireland.

I am emailing as I hope to recruit leaders in the festival industry in Ireland to be interviewed about their perspectives on the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers. These insights will complement the quantitative research I have undertaken already with over 130 early Gen Zers.

If you would be interested in participating, I would be delighted to come to your place of work, or wherever would be convenient for you, to conduct the interview. The interview would be semi structured in nature, and should take between 40 minutes to 1 hour. Your contribution would be greatly appreciated.

Please note that the researcher will record the discussion that occurs during the interview. Therefore by consenting to participate, you are agreeing to the
recording of your contribution. Your contribution will subsequently be
anonymised. However, you will be identified as being associated with either a
community festival, a music festival, or a tourism organisation in the research
(e.g., Participant X, Music Festival Organiser). The festival(s) you are associated
with will not be named.

Thank you so much for your consideration and I would love to hear from you.

Best wishes,

Sinead O’ Mahony
Appendix H - Supplementary Information about the Project

Description of the research project

My name is Sinead O’ Mahony and I am a post-graduate Masters by Research student with the Irish Academy of Hospitality and Tourism (IAHT), and Department of Hotel, Culinary Arts, and Tourism at Institute of Technology, Tralee. My research is entitled ‘An exploration of the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland’ (working title).

Who are Generation Z?

Generation Z is suggested to include those individuals born between the years of 1995 and 2009. At the time of last census, Generation Z represented approximately 20% of the Irish population (CSO, 2016). The primary goal of this research is to explore the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. I am conducting this study as the basis for my MA.

This research focuses specifically on early Generation Z, those aged between 18 and 23 years old at the time of this research. There is very limited existing research exploring the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.

A mixed methods design is used in this study. Preliminary research in the form of quantitative data has been collected via an online self-administered survey and an analysis of data from 131 participants aged between 18 and 23 years old has been carried out. For the second stage of data collection, I hope to recruit leaders in the festival/tourism industry in Ireland to be interviewed about their perspectives on the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of early Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland. These insights will complement quantitative research I have undertaken already.

Research objectives

The research objectives are subject to change but are currently as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To determine the wants and needs of Generation Z festival-goers in Ireland.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To evaluate the extent to which technology shapes how Generation Z festival-goers interacts with festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To appraise the motivating factors influencing Generation Z festival-goers’ level of attendance and participation at festivals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. To identify the range of factors necessary to target and cater for the needs of Generation Z festival-goers in the short and medium term.

5. To determine the characteristics of Generation Z festival-goers' behaviour at festivals.

Where I am in the project

As discussed, the preliminary quantitative data has been collected and analysed and it is hoped that these semi-structured interviews will build upon the findings that emerged from the preliminary data.

I am asking for this interview as the qualitative interviews will add more depth to the quantitative analysis.

By undertaking interviews with leaders in the festival/tourism industry, insights will be gathered which will complement the quantitative research I have undertaken already with over 130 early Gen Zers. Samples from two different populations will participate in this study which will provide pioneering insight into this topic. It is hoped that the research will be of significant value to those involved in producing and organising festivals in Ireland, and planning tourism policy in this area. It is envisaged that the findings of this research will be presented to tourism bodies and those operating within the festival industry in Ireland.

The interview schedule incorporates the list of questions that the researcher intends to ask the interviewee. The nature of a semi-structured interview means that although the interview schedule provides a structure, if the interviewee (yourself) or interviewer/researcher introduces a topic that isn’t included within the interview schedule into the discussion, this will be accommodated.

Anonymity of the interviews

Your contribution to the study will be completely anonymous and will be kept in strict confidence. Your contribution to the discussion during this interview will be anonymised with a participant number. A participant number will be assigned to all data collected and participants’ names will not be associated with quotations used in the study. Any personal details or testimony will not be released at any time. The final report will not reveal any participants’ names, in order to assure participants’ anonymity. However, you will be identified as being
associated with either a community festival, a music festival, or a tourism organisation in the research (e.g., Participant X, Music Festival Organiser). The festival(s) you are associated with will not be named.

**How the interviewee will be identified in the study**

Please note that the researcher will record the discussion that occurs during the interview. Therefore by consenting to participate, you are agreeing to the recording of your contribution. Your contribution will subsequently be anonymised. However, you will be identified as being associated with either a community festival, a music festival, or a tourism organisation in the research (e.g., Participant X, Music Festival Organiser). The festival(s) you are associated with will not be named.

**Recording process**

The researcher will indicate when the recording device/devices is/are being turned on. The researcher will indicate when the recorder device/devices is/are being turned off. The interview recording will subsequently be transcribed by the researcher.

**Length of interview**

The interview will be 40 minutes to 1 hour in length.
Appendix I - Intended Interview Schedule Scripts for Semi-Structured Interviews

Please note there were some diversions from the intended scripts in the real-life interviews, and the researcher used a conversational approach when undertaking the semi-structured interviews.

a.) Intended Interview Schedule Script for Festival Organisers’ Interviews

Hi Participant,
Thank you for meeting with me today. I am about to begin the interview. I will turn on the recording device/devices now. Can I check that you are happy for the reminder of the interview to be recorded?
Wait for answer.
Thank you. I am now going to start the interview.
The first question I’d like to ask is…

1. Had you heard much about Generation Z before I reached out to you?
2. What age groups are you aiming your festival(s) at?
3. What have you observed about Generation Z at festivals?
4. What type of attractions appeal to Gen Z at your festival(s)?
5. What do you think are the key factors that motivate Generation Z to attend festivals?
6. What are the key elements that you believe lead Generation Z to look forward to festivals?
7. To what extent do you think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to experience culture?
8. To what extent do you think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to make new friends or acquaintances?
9. To what extent do you think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to strengthen their relationships with their current friends?
10. To what extent do you think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to show off their experiences, potentially via social media?
11. To what extent do you think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to gain popularity?
12. To quote Jackson and Marsh (1996), “When in flow, a person becomes totally involved in an activity and experiences a number of positive experiential characteristics, including freedom from self-consciousness and great enjoyment
of the process”. To what extent do you think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to experience flow?

13. Of all of these reasons for attending I have mentioned, to experience culture, to make new friends or acquaintances, to strengthen their relationships with their current friends, to show off their experiences, potentially via social media, to gain popularity, and to experience flow, which do you think is the most important?

14. To what extent do you think it is important to incorporate photo opportunities or production elements that make for great photos into the content of your festival(s), i.e., features that Generation Z take pictures with or alongside?

15. Following on from the previous question, if so, do you allocate specific amounts of the production or content budget to this?

16. To what extent do you think that Generation Z attendees place priority on capturing and sharing their festival experiences?

17. To what extent do you think that technology affects how “present” and “in the moment” Generation Z attendees are at your festival(s)?

18. To what extent do you think that technology affects how engaged Generation Z attendees are with the content of your festival(s)?

19. What do you believe leads Generation Z attendees to engage and be “in the moment” at festivals?

20. To what extent do you think that technology affects how “present” and “in the moment” Generation Z attendees are at your festival(s)?

21. What do you currently know about the wants and needs of Generation Z attendees who attend your festival(s)?

22. Have you previously done market research on Generation Z attendees who attend your festival(s)?

23. What do you believe festival organisers need to do to cater for the market of Generation Z festival-goers in the near future?

24. What do you believe festival organisers need to do to cater for the market of Generation Z festival-goers in the more medium to long-term future?

25. What kind of research do you think is needed regarding the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z attendees in relation to festivals?

Thanks very much for your contribution today. The interview is now ended and I will turn off the recording device/devices now. Here is the debriefing form for you to keep.
Intended Interview Schedule Script for Interviewee from Tourism Organisation

Again this was the intended script and diversions from the script did occur.

Hi Participant,

Thank you for meeting with me today. I am about to begin the interview. I will turn on the recording device/devices now. Can I check that you are happy for the reminder of the interview to be recorded?

Wait for answer.

Thank you. I am now going to start the interview.

The first question I’d like to ask is…

Point to clarify at beginning of interview: This research is looking at festival-goers in Ireland, so those based in Ireland but not necessarily Irish.

1. What does Generation Z mean to (specific organisation)/to you?
2. Has research been conducted on Generation Z within (specific organisation)?

Probing questions here:
What kind of research?
What did it involve?
When was it carried out?

3. What has (specific organisation) observed about Generation Z, particularly in relation to festivals and events?
4. What do (specific organisation) think are the key factors that motivate Generation Z to attend festivals?
5. Has (specific organisation) observed distinct differences between Gen Z and other generations?

Probing questions: Why or why not? (applicable to all questions from 6 –14)

6. What do (specific organisation) think are the key elements that lead Generation Z to look forward to festivals?
7. To what extent do (specific organisation) think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to experience culture?
8. To what extent do (specific organisation) think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to make new friends or acquaintances?

9. To what extent do (specific organisation) think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to strengthen their relationships with their current friends?

10. To what extent do (specific organisation) think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to show off their experiences, potentially via social media?

11. To what extent do (specific organisation) think that Generation Z attendees attend festivals to gain popularity?

12. To what extent do (specific organisation) think it is important to incorporate photo opportunities or production elements that make for great photos into the content of festivals, i.e., features that Generation Z take pictures with or alongside?

13. To what extent do (specific organisation) think that Generation Z attendees place priority on capturing and sharing their festival experiences?

14. To what extent do (specific organisation) think that technology affects how “present” and “in the moment” Generation Z attendees are at festivals?

15. What does (specific organisation) believe leads Generation Z attendees to engage and be “in the moment” at festivals?

16. What does (specific organisation) currently know about the wants and needs of Generation Z attendees who attend festivals?

17. What does (specific organisation) believe festival organisers need to do to cater for the market of Generation Z festival-goers in the near future?

18. What does (specific organisation) believe festival organisers need to do to cater for the market of Generation Z festival-goers in the more medium to long-term future?

19. What kind of research does (specific organisation) think is needed regarding the attitudes, motivations and behaviours of Generation Z attendees in relation to festivals?

20. What plans have (specific organisation) got to market to early Generation Z in the short-term, bearing in mind the earliest members of this cohort will be 27 years old in 3 years’ time?

21. What plans have (specific organisation) got to market to early Generation Z in more medium to long-term, bearing in mind the earliest members of this cohort will be 27 years old in 3 years’ time?

22. How do you plan on learning more about this cohort in the interim or Are you planning on conducting further research on this cohort group in the interim? (if
(specific organisation) has already researched this group). If not remove "further".

23. Are there any challenges associated with researching this group?
24. Are there any challenges associated with marketing to this group?

Thanks very much for your contribution today. The interview is now ended and I will turn off the recording device/devices now. Here is the debriefing form for you to keep.
### Appendix J - Cronbach’s alpha values for each reflective factor

**Table 4.4 Cronbach’s alpha values for each reflective factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Label</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Construct Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known Group Socialisation</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Popularity</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Socialisation</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Exploration</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix K - Validity Analysis

Table 4.6 Validity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>KG</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.273**</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.276**</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.223*</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.168†</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.370***</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.488***</td>
<td>0.253**</td>
<td>0.314***</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>0.171†</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is not specified in the model

Significance of Correlations:

† p < 0.100
* p < 0.050
** p < 0.010
*** p < 0.001
Appendix L - HTMT Analysis

Table 4.7 HTMT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KG</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix M - Model Fit Measures

Table 4.8 Model Fit Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Threshold¹</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN</td>
<td>810.992</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>593.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>Between 1 and 3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>Between 0.90 and &lt;0.95</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>&lt;0.06</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PClose</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 4.5 Measurement Model (Reflective Latent Constructs)
Appendix O - Measurement Model (Formative Latent Constructs)

Figure 4.6 Measurement Model (Formative Latent Constructs)
Appendix P - Measurement Model (Formative Latent Constructs - Weights and Loadings)

Figure 4.7 Measurement Model (Formative Latent Constructs - Weights and Loadings)
Appendix Q - Validity Analysis including the specific bias markers

Table 4.10 Validity Analysis including the specific bias markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>KG</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.273**</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-0.277**</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.221*</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.166†</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.370***</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.488***</td>
<td>-0.254*</td>
<td>0.312**</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>0.171†</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R - HTMT Analysis including the specific bias markers

Table 4.11 HTMT Analysis including the specific bias markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KG</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix S - Measurement Model Common Latent Factor – Specific Bias extraction

Figure 4.8 Measurement Model Common Latent Factor – Specific Bias extraction
Table 4.15 Summary of Findings - Direct Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Standardised Direct Effect</th>
<th>Bootstrapped Standardised Bias-corrected 90% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Effect Size ($f^2$) $^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_1$</td>
<td>External Socialisation</td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>.402***</td>
<td>.258 to .547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_2$</td>
<td>Known Group Socialisation</td>
<td>Social Capital$^2$</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>.031 to .343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_3$</td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td>.033 to .343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_4$</td>
<td>Perceived Popularity</td>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>.109†</td>
<td>.012 to .289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_5$</td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>.183*</td>
<td>.036 to .229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_6$</td>
<td>Known Group Socialisation$^3$</td>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>.194***</td>
<td>.031 to .343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_7$</td>
<td>External Socialisation$^3$</td>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>.065 to .308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_8$</td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>.299***</td>
<td>.168 to .430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_9$</td>
<td>Event Anticipation$^3$</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>.289***</td>
<td>.111 to .434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_{10}$</td>
<td>Event Attractions</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>.084 to .406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_{11}$</td>
<td>Event Attractions</td>
<td>Event Anticipation</td>
<td>.291***</td>
<td>.139 to .439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_{12}$</td>
<td>Event Attractions$^3$</td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>.299***</td>
<td>.166 to .430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Small (.02) = .15 = Medium .35 = Large

$^2$ Social Capital

$^3$ Event Attractions
Significance of Correlations:
† p < 0.100  
* p < 0.050  
** p < 0.010  
*** p < 0.001

2 The R-Square for Social Capital is just 7%. This diminishes the value of significant predictors to Social Capital.
3 These *post hoc* pathways were suggested by AMOS in order to achieve adequate model fit.
Appendix U - Summary of Findings - Mediation Effects

Table 4.16 Summary of Findings - Mediation Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Path</th>
<th>Standardised Estimate</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (Lower bound - Upper Bound)</th>
<th>$p$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simple two-path mediation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Flow mediates the positive relationship between <strong>External Socialisation</strong> and <strong>Event Anticipation</strong></td>
<td>0.073*</td>
<td>0.012 - 0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Flow mediates the positive relationship between <strong>Event Attractions</strong> and <strong>Event Anticipation</strong></td>
<td>0.055*</td>
<td>0.007 - 0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Flow mediates the positive relationship between <strong>Event Attractions</strong> and <strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.089***</td>
<td>0.044 - 0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td><strong>Event Anticipation</strong> mediates the positive relationship between <strong>Event Attractions</strong> and <strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.084**</td>
<td>0.028 - 0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td><strong>Social Capital</strong> mediates the positive relationship between <strong>Known Group Socialisation</strong> and <strong>Event Anticipation</strong></td>
<td>0.032*</td>
<td>0.004 – 0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td><strong>Event Anticipation</strong> mediates the positive relationship between <strong>Known Group Socialisation</strong> and <strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.054**</td>
<td>0.021 – 0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td><strong>Social Capital</strong> mediates the positive relationship between <strong>External Socialisation</strong> and <strong>Event Anticipation</strong></td>
<td>0.022†</td>
<td>0.033 – 0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Flow mediates the positive relationship between <strong>External Socialisation</strong> and <strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.120***</td>
<td>0.067 – 0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td><strong>Event Anticipation</strong> mediates the positive relationship between <strong>External Socialisation</strong> and <strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.066**</td>
<td>0.026 – 0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td><strong>Event Anticipation</strong> mediates the positive relationship between <strong>Social Capital</strong> and <strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.048*</td>
<td>0.009 – 0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td><strong>Event Anticipation</strong> mediates the positive relationship between <strong>Flow</strong> and <strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.053*</td>
<td>0.012 – 0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Relationship Mediation</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Lower 95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Event Anticipation</strong> mediates the positive relationship between <strong>Perceived Popularity</strong> and <strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.031†</td>
<td>0.005 – 0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serial three-path mediation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flow and Event Anticipation</strong> mediate the positive relationship between <strong>External Socialisation and Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.073*</td>
<td>0.064 – 0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social Capital and Event Anticipation</strong> mediate the positive relationship between <strong>External Socialisation and Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.022†</td>
<td>0.000 – 0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social Capital and Event Anticipation</strong> mediate the positive relationship between <strong>Known Group Socialisation and Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.032*</td>
<td>0.001 – 0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flow and Event Anticipation</strong> mediate the positive relationship between <strong>External Socialisation and Attendance</strong></td>
<td>0.055*</td>
<td>0.003 – 0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance of Estimates:*
† $p < 0.100$
* $p < 0.050$
** $p < 0.010$
*** $p < 0.001$

2 The R-Square for Social Capital is just 8%. This diminishes the value of statistically significant predictors to Social Capital.
3 These estimated indirect effects were *post hoc* considerations and presented by AMOS.
### Table 4.17 Summary of Findings - Interaction Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Interaction Effect</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>An increase in inhibition will strengthen the positive relationship between Flow and Event Anticipation</td>
<td>0.094*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Estimates:

- † *p < 0.100
- * *p < 0.050
- ** *p < 0.010
- *** *p < 0.001
Appendix W - Moderation - Interaction

Figure 4.11 Moderation - Interaction
### Appendix X - Constructs and their remaining items as well as their operational definitions in relation to this study

Table 4.18 Validated constructs and remaining items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct: Cultural Exploration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>While at festivals, I like to experience customs and cultures different from those in my own environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE2</td>
<td>While at festivals, I seek out cultural events that I do not normally have the opportunity to go to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE4</td>
<td>I want there to be a sense of discovery involved as part of my festival experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE7</td>
<td>While at festivals, I like to increase my knowledge of local culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals for cultural experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct: External Socialisation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ExS2</td>
<td>I chat with new people at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExS4</td>
<td>I meet new people who enjoy the same things as I do at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExS5</td>
<td>I meet new people with similar interests to me at festivals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals to make new connections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct: Known Group Socialisation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGS1</td>
<td>Festivals allow me to be with my friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGS2</td>
<td>I like to go to festivals with a friend group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGS3</td>
<td>I like to spend quality time with my friend group at festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGS4</td>
<td>Festivals allow me to spend quality time with my friend group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGS5</td>
<td>Festivals allow our friend group to hang out together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGS6</td>
<td>Festivals allow our friend group to get really close.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals to strengthen their current connections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct: Social Capital</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>Being able to share my festival experience on social media is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
important to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC2</th>
<th>I enjoy showing others my festival experiences on social media.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC5</td>
<td>I like to get at least one great image of my festival experience to share on social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC6</td>
<td>Capturing my festival experience for others to see is important to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which Generation Z are motivated to go to festivals in order to show off their experiences, potentially via social media.

**Construct: Perceived Popularity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PP1</th>
<th>People in my friend group who go to festivals have more prestige than those who do not.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP2</td>
<td>People in my friend group who go to festivals have a high profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>Going to a festival is a status symbol in my friend group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP4</td>
<td>People in my friend group who go to festivals are more popular that those who do not go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP5</td>
<td>People in my friend group who go to festivals are cooler than those who don’t go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals to enhance their image in their social system.

**Construct: Flow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FL2</th>
<th>I was not concerned with what others may have been thinking of me at the festival.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>The way time passed at the festival seemed to be different from normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL6</td>
<td>I did things more spontaneously at the festival than usual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which Generation Z attendees felt in the moment and mindful of what was taking place while they attended their chosen festival.

**Construct: Attendance**

| ATT1  | I am very much up for attending festivals.                                         |
### ATT2
Going to festivals makes me happy.

### ATT3
I am not put off attending festivals because of cost.

### ATT4
I am not put off attending festivals because of travel distance.

### ATT5
I am not put off attending festivals because of festival line-up

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which Generation Z attendees attend festivals.

### Construct: Inhibition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN1</th>
<th>I am shy when I have to talk to an unfamiliar person.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN2</td>
<td>I talk easily to an unfamiliar person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN3</td>
<td>I feel nervous when I have to talk to an unfamiliar person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN4</td>
<td>I feel good and I am able to laugh when I talk to an unfamiliar person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which the participant shows “individual differences in shyness, fear and withdrawal reactions when encountering novel or unfamiliar situations” (Kagan, 1997 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.331; Kagan, Reznick & Sniderman, 1987 cited in Shatz, 2005, p.331).

### Construct: Negative Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD6</th>
<th>I like to gossip at times.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD7</td>
<td>There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD8</td>
<td>I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD9</td>
<td>At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which participants answer the survey questions in a socially desirable way.

### Construct: Positive Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD1</th>
<th>I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD3</td>
<td>I never resent being asked to return a favor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD4</td>
<td>I have never been annoyed when people expressed ideas very different from my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD5</td>
<td>I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original operationalised definition for this study:** The degree to which participants answer the survey questions in a socially desirable way.

### Construct: Event Anticipation
### Operationalised definition for Event Anticipation (new) for this study:
The degree to which Generation Z attendees look forward to a festival.

### Construct: Event Attractions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EvAttr1</th>
<th>I go to festivals to enjoy special events.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EvAttr2</td>
<td>I go to festivals to see new and different things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvAttr3</td>
<td>I go to festivals to enjoy the festival mood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvAttr4</td>
<td>I go to festivals to enjoy a unique atmosphere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvAttr5</td>
<td>I attend festivals that sound like fun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revised Operationalised definition for Event Attractions (new) for this study:
The degree to which events by their very nature attract Generation Z attendees.